



# WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE JEWS?

BY  
JOSEPH LEFTWICH

WITH A FOREWORD BY  
STEFAN ZWEIG

LONDON  
P. S. KING & SON, LTD.  
ORCHARD HOUSE, 14 GREAT SMITH STREET  
WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1  
1936

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

*To*  
THE IMMORTAL MEMORY  
OF  
ISRAEL ZANGWILL





## CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
FOREWORD . . . . .	ix
I. "MAY THEY CONTINUE TO EMIGRATE!". . .	I
II. THE JEWS ARE NOT A WANDERING PEOPLE .	25
III. "THE BROADER THE BASIS FOR ANY IMMIGRATION PROGRAMME . . . THE GREATER CHANCE FOR THE SUCCESS OF SUCH A VENTURE" . . .	60
IV. WHERE DOES THE JEW BELONG ? . . .	81
V. DIASPORA AND PALESTINE . . . . .	110
VI. BIRO-BIDJAN . . . . .	136
VII. WHERE CAN THEY GO ? . . . . .	163
VIII. THE QUEST OF THE JEWISH TERRITORIAL ORGAN- ISATION . . . . .	185
IX. ITO REDIVIVUS . . . . .	207
X. THE SHAPES ARISE . . . . .	230



## FOREWORD

MY DEAR JOSEPH LEFOWICH,

I am very glad I was able to see your book before publication. I have learnt much from it, for it reveals from a multiplicity of aspects the entire complexity of the Jewish problem of to-day, while refraining from any political or controversial partisanship. I completely share your underlying idea—that the Jewish problem has become so much of a problem only because of the economic maladjustment of Europe, which, as a whole, finds itself since 1914 in a state of permanent crisis. What Clemenceau said before the war—words terribly dangerous but terribly true—about “*Allemagne congestionnée*,” applies to-day to our entire continent. Europe is *congestionnée*, over-full of blood, and therefore irritable, provoked, hyper-dynamic ; and if the barbaric method of warlike blood-letting is to be avoided, there remains only one cure and healing : that, as for centuries, the surplus people of this overcrowded “little peninsula of Asia,” as Nietzsche called it, should be diverted and canalised into the sparsely populated parts of other continents.

This road you propose to the Jews of all those European countries where they are subjected to exceptional pressure, and you thus find your way perhaps into a certain antithesis to the radical Zionists, who

insist solely and entirely upon the colonisation and national reacquisition of Palestine. But, first of all, this national colonisation of Palestine is still confronted by political obstacles; and secondly, it is impossible to dismiss the question whether after 2,000 years of continuous migration of peoples it is possible to resume the reconstruction of an original status. In any event, the Jewish problem is to-day much greater than Palestine, and calls for a more accelerated subsidence. That is why I agree with your trend of thought, that national and international emigration should proceed side by side, and this dual form of action seems to me entirely in the tradition of Jewish history. There always was in Jewish life a powerful national movement and simultaneously a universal tendency. I need only recall what Josephus Flavius reports the defenders of the Temple to have said: "If we should, indeed, as Cæsar says, be vanquished, the Fatherland does not matter. God still has the world, which is a greater Temple than this." Should the Jews withdraw now entirely and solely to Palestine, they would thereby voluntarily subscribe to the worst suspicions of their enemies, that they were everywhere but an alien body. The fact is, however, that our spiritual culture has been preserved and has developed in all other languages, as much as in our own. Everywhere Jews have, as a co-operating and even a stimulating factor, identified themselves with the countries in which they have found their home, and the rise of many nations and cities has been promoted and accelerated by their presence. It is an entirely wrong conclusion to deny the Jews colonising ability, because one looks only at the Jews of Western Europe, who

have been concentrated by force of circumstances in intellectual and commercial occupations. This is to forget the millions of small artisans and peasants in Eastern Europe who live abstemiously and engage in the hardest physical labour, and who, transplanted to new lands which will allow them space and freedom, would prove themselves among their most valuable citizens. There are hundreds of thousands of Jewish people who are willing to do any work, anywhere, and it would be the task, as you rightly perceive, of a systematically working organisation to direct these forces to the right place, so that by their latent energies they should open up undeveloped land, to make it fruitful and prosperous. Such transplanting would relieve Europe not only of its surplus people, but also of its surplus enmities. Contrasts would become modified, harmony would spread, and thus an economic need would fulfil a moral duty.

There is only one thing that must be much more emphasised. Such an outer organisation for transplanting and colonising people presupposes an inner organisation, a united will. Among the statesmen and deciding political factors who could promote this transplanting work, there are probably more than we think who would be willing to interest themselves in such a project and help to carry it through. But these well-intentioned people often get confused because they are constantly being approached on the Jewish side by different people, now with one project and now with another, instead of with one single, agreed plan. Nothing seems to me more important than that such an agreed plan, representing the whole of Jewry, should be drawn up and put forward ; that these six-

teen million Jews should at last set up one body, which will autonomously and responsibly represent their interests, and that all the various rivalries and hostilities of the different groups should be subordinated to the need of such a united and authoritative representation before the world. Only a clearly prepared, carefully considered plan, a really creative and at the same time realisable idea, can convert the various improvisations into a definite proposal or demand. Your book seems to me an excellent preparation for such a comprehensive plan, and that is why it is immeasurably more important than all the vague psychological generalisations about this painfully pressing problem.

Yours,  
STEFAN ZWEIG.

LONDON,  
*April 23rd, 1936.*

## CHAPTER I

### "MAY THEY CONTINUE TO EMIGRATE!"

BARON DE GUNZBURG, the famous Russo-Jewish philanthropist, once presented a memorandum to Czar Alexander III, in which he pleaded for an improvement of the treatment of the Jewish population of the country. Their present treatment in Russia, he told the Czar, is resulting in a big Jewish emigration movement from Russia. Thank God! Alexander III commented in the margin. May they continue to emigrate!

A similar answer, one may suspect, would be returned to any such memorandum presented to the present rulers of Germany. After all, that was the burthen of the letter of resignation sent to the League of Nations by Mr. James G. MacDonald, the League's High Commissioner for Refugees from Germany: "If the present pressure is not relieved, it is inconceivable that those who can flee will remain within Germany."

"My hands, you know, were forced by the persecutions," Baron de Hirsch, the founder of the Jewish Colonisation Association, explained, when he started his movement of transplanting Russian Jews to the Argentine. "If my energies or my fortune could accomplish it, believe me, the whole Jewish population of Russia would be taken out of the country to-morrow."



To-day, it is from Germany that Jews should be enabled to escape. From Germany, and from Poland and other East European countries, where the inexorable process of economic development, the growth of population and the consequent displacement of Jews, has resulted in the economic ruination of millions of Jews. In Poland and in other East European countries, the Jews formed for centuries the only middle order between the nobles and the serfs. They acted as the corn-merchants, shopkeepers, innkeepers ; almost every branch of traffic was in their hands. The nobles would not do it ; the serfs were not allowed to do it. The Jews were asked to do it. After the abolition of serfdom, the arrangement persisted ; the serfs continued where they were, as peasants. Even to-day, Poland is still mainly a peasant country. But the rapid growth of population, the altered economic conditions, the world-wide agrarian crisis and other factors, have resulted in all these branches of activity being invaded by non-Jewish Poles. Without any evil intent, by sheer economic pressure, millions of Jews are being displaced and pauperised. M. Titus Filipowicz, speaking officially as Polish Envoy and Minister Extraordinary Plenipotentiary to the United States, explained on one occasion that

the co-operative movement is developing strongly in Poland, and it is unfortunate that under this economic reorganisation of eliminating the middleman, the Jew, whose principal occupation was to act as a middleman, should be the principal sufferer. The population is increasing at the rate of about 400,000 annually, and means have to be found to provide for this increase.

Millions of Jews in Poland and elsewhere in Eastern

Europe have as a result lost every means of economic subsistence. Of course, not only Jews are suffering in these countries. Distress and unemployment is widespread. It would be foolish to suggest that the starving Polish peasant or the struggling Polish small-trader is taking the bread out of the mouth of the Jew. As I write, Dr. Nahum Sokolow, Honorary President of the Zionist Organisation and of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and also of the Federation of Polish Jews in Great Britain, has stated :

The position of the Polish workers and peasants is desperate. Millions are unemployed, and the peasants are not able to sell their produce and cannot buy bare necessities. So they become an easy prey to the incitement of the antisemites.

Though it seems to be true that only the Jew seeking employment finds the Civil Service and all Government monopoly enterprises and the big co-operative system closed to him. And there definitely exists a state of affairs under which millions of people belonging to the Jewish faith have been economically uprooted and have no hope for the future save in emigration.

Jews have been from the beginning pioneers in Polish industry. They built most of the railways in Poland, the banks, the sugar industry, the glass factories ; they were the first to bring the motor-car into the country ; they introduced the cinema, textiles, artificial silk, rubber goods. They held the timber-industry and the tobacco-trade. To-day, Government ownership of industry is extending to every branch of production. Trade in tobacco, timber, grain, oil, salt, feather, eggs are all in Government hands. And tens of thousands of Jews have, in consequence, lost their livelihood. You will look in vain in Poland for a Jewish railway-worker, postman or Government employee of any kind.

That is how a Jewish writer in Poland describes the situation. "It is not the fault of either the Government or the Jews," Sholem Asch, the famous Yiddish novelist, explains, however, "but of circumstances and a combination of a number of factors." Indeed, the crisis is world-wide, and no country or group of people is exempt. These millions of displaced and suffering Jews are not just victims of wanton anti-Jewish plotting. They, too, are victims of the crisis. The antisemite is, after all, but a one-sided utopian, as wrong-headed in his conviction that it only needs the extermination of the Jew-parasite (it was the half-Jew Karl Marx who invented the term) to bring the millenium, as is the Socialist or Communist in his conviction that it will be brought by the extermination of the capitalist-parasite, the single-taxer that it will be brought by the extermination of the landlord-parasite, or the prohibitionist that it will be brought by the extermination of the brewer-publican-parasite. But there has never been a time when the world was free from crisis. When God turned Adam and Eve out of Eden and put an angel with flaming sword in as bailiff, we had our first crisis—and unlike every subsequent crisis, even the Flood, it involved the whole of the world's population. Yet of all our crises, at bottom the assurance of the Psalmist still holds good—"The world is set firm."

But meanwhile, conditions being what they are, where shall they go, these millions of surplus Jews in Poland and other East European countries, and those in Germany who "if the present pressure is not relieved" must flee from Germany? High Commissioner MacDonald, in his letter of resignation to the League

of Nations, declared that "in the present economic conditions of the world the European States, and even those oversea, have only a limited power of absorption of refugees." It is true that the High Commissioner has had a very unfortunate experience in his search for immigration opportunities. The existence of a considerable unemployment problem in almost every country of the world has made it difficult for the Governments concerned to consider any proposals for relaxing the present immigration restrictions.

But there is also in official circles a very marked disinclination to take a broad view of the problem and to deal with it on a large scale, on which alone it is possible to deal with it. It is such an immense problem that they are afraid to touch it; they fear it is more than they can at present undertake. And it is a vicious circle. For as long as no immigration is permitted into the sparsely populated parts of the world they cannot be developed and absorb more population. There is no room for small trickles of immigration. They would only run into inconvenient corners and make them unpleasantly damp and muddy. They would form puddles and quagmires. But a large stream of immigration could carry off much of the present congestion and could provide a broad highway for increased economic traffic. "The idea that in all circumstances immigration merely increases unemployment is fallacious." An economic authority recently pointed out

that even in the United States, from the period when the population was only three million right down to to-day when it is about a hundred and twenty million, there have been people constantly asking: how can the country

support the growing population? The history of the United States has in this respect been paralleled by that of most of the other advanced countries of the world. Australia and Canada to-day are less able to absorb one million people because they are undeveloped, than they will be able to absorb five million when they are more developed. The pre-war Palestine could not have absorbed five thousand immigrants a year, while to-day the country is able to absorb ten times that number. Resources grow with the increased population.

(within the limits, of course, of its absorptive capacity). And Sir Herbert Samuel, who was High Commissioner for Palestine, and knows the conditions, pointed out in March 1936, that

the absorptive capacity of Palestine is not a fixed thing. It is different to-day from what it was in 1920, and it will be different again in 1940. Our task [he added] is to develop and increase that absorptive capacity.

The same economic authority I quoted previously, emphasises, in dealing with the supposed advantages of the self-sufficiency of a country, that it is only economically undeveloped and culturally backward countries that are really self-sufficient. As the *Daily Telegraph* recently stated editorially :

What should be made clear is that the presence of new settlers, if they are successful, is a positive gain to the Dominion, as providing a new market for goods and especially for those common services (including administration and railways) which impose such heavy overhead charges on the scanty populations which at present use them.

Bagehot has also drawn attention to the fact that progress is promoted by competitive examination, and this principle explains why the "protected" regions of

the world—the interior of Continents like Africa, outlying islands like Australia or New Zealand—are of necessity backward. They are still in the preparatory school.

They cannot, amid a land-hungry world, be kept indefinitely in the preparatory school. Yet the attitude of official circles on the immigration question was recently described by Sir Henry Page-Croft, in the House of Commons, as “pessimistic and almost defeatist.” And an important Empire Settlement Society reports that “the official view concerning immigration continues to be ‘nothing doing,’ though the fact is concealed in more elaborate English.”

On the eve of the last Christmas recess, the House of Commons accepted a motion expressing its opinion “that the time has arrived when immediate steps should be taken to survey the possibilities for re-starting emigration within the Empire,” and it was decided to set up an Empire Migration Board to consider specific proposals for schemes of emigration. “They had to do something,” said Captain Macnamara, who moved the resolution, “otherwise they would find that foreign countries would be demanding that they should be given the chance.” Mr. A. A. Somerville, supporting the motion, said that “it was not fair that these small islands should have the task of defending one-fifth of the world.” (A point that had been put before the war—in July 1914—by Israel Zangwill, when he wrote: “To hold nearly one-fourth of the globe with only—outside these islands—some ten million white men is certainly a miracle of history. But it seems to me a very unstable miracle.”) Mr. Somerville, incidentally, claimed in his speech “that Australia and Canada should each have a population

of 100 million, instead of a few millions." And so sober a paper as the *Daily Telegraph*, in commenting next day in its editorial article on the Debate, declared : " That it is impossible for the Dominions to continue indefinitely as under-populated areas in a land-hungry world is undeniable."

We had an unexampled piece of good luck in being allowed to annex North America and the whole of Australasia [Dean Inge wrote a few months ago]. There are no other empty countries on anything like the same scale. . . . As for Australia, its inhabitants are keeping it empty. For whom ?

Sir Edward Grigg, M.P., has declared before the Royal Empire Society that " The Empire could not indefinitely reserve for itself a large proportion of the emptier parts of the habitable globe unless it settled population where there was none and put idle land to use."

And, as Israel Zangwill and others have pointed out :

To populate the great empty spaces of the British Empire with the surplus population—under a falling birth-rate—(the Registrar General has disclosed in his statistical review for 1933 that the birth-rate in England and Wales has reached the lowest level ever recorded) of two little islands is impossible. Never was there a more comical example of the desire to eat one's cake and to have it, too [Zangwill added]. Even from a moral point of view I question the right of any country to hold territories it cannot populate while other races are agonising for lack of a place in the sun.

It is what Captain Macnamara urged in moving his resolution in the House of Commons : " They had to do something—otherwise they would find that foreign

countries would be demanding that they should be given the chance."

Mr. J. A. Lyons, the Prime Minister of the Australian Commonwealth, said the same thing in March 1936, in a reply to recommendations submitted to him by the Conference of Associated Chambers of Commerce, held at Adelaide: "Nations are seeking expansion, and Australia cannot justify her position as long as she is not occupying her lands adequately. The time has come when we must re-examine the question of emigration."

There are, in fact, several distinct aspects of this immigration problem. The first is a very natural desire to assist the necessary redistribution of population within the Empire, of "sending men, women and children from their dismal life in the distressed areas out into countries where they would have a chance now and in the future." Though, obviously, those sent out must be people capable of adjusting themselves to the new conditions, suitable settlers of the new countries. Mr. Hacking, the Chairman of the Conservative Party, who was then Under-Secretary of State for the Dominions, pointed out in his speech, winding up the Debate:

To regard immigration solely as a means of relieving unemployment in this country was an entirely wrong idea. It would be disastrous if immigration, even though it reduced our own unemployment in this country resulted in the creation of unemployment in other parts of the Empire.

Yet it is obviously right that any immigration to the Dominions should be primarily that of British people, who should have the first chance. And it is also



natural that the Dominions should desire to have whatever immigration is admitted primarily British, so as to retain their predominantly British character.

That is one aspect of the problem. But there are also others. An official publication issued by the Australian Government, emphasises, for example, that "the spread of population in this Empire is highly important. The filling of the Empire's empty spaces represents a necessity apparent to the mind of every thinking person." It looks forward, of course, to their filling with British people—

to a day when the Empire's lands will be well held everywhere by British people, and when there will be in every part of the world over which our common flag flies, the means to defend with adequate number the great investment owned by the British race in all parts of the world—especially in the Commonwealth of Australia, where more British money is invested than in any other country outside Great Britain itself; where, indeed, the investment is not only of British money, but of British blood also, because virtually the whole of the people of the Commonwealth are of British extraction.

The need of keeping the Empire British is, indeed, no less important than the need of filling the Empire. But while it is recognised that "the empty spaces" must be filled, it is also agreed that it is impossible to populate them only with the surplus population of the British Isles. That these should have priority goes without saying. But there are not enough of them to populate the Empire. Also there are many British people who do not wish to leave home; they are afraid of venturing far afield, and running the risk of finding themselves destitute thousands of miles away. And there are many unemployed who would

not be suitable for the new countries. The Dominion Governments do not want an increase in their own unemployment. Settling people is not enough. They must fit into the national economy and pay their way. The Australian Government publication I have quoted remarks that

there are some who think that a man on the land can sustain himself. That is ridiculous. Even from his own products he cannot sustain himself. It is impossible in these days for people on the land to be self-supplying and self-sustaining, when the women of the house no longer grind the corn for bread or spin or weave cloth for clothes, and when the men of the house must themselves be doing things other than making their own footgear and fashioning their own implements for agriculture and so forth. The British men and women who are building this Empire cannot subsist on blue skies and wide open spaces. They do not buy groceries or the services of the doctor and dentist; they have no value when it comes to meeting rates and taxes, house building, furnishing, costs of repairs, farm machinery, manures, fencing, drainage, school-fees, clothes, travel and many other forms of service requesting monetary obligations.

And there is, too, a limit to the development of the primary industries, of the agricultural and pastoral pursuits, even if the inhabitants of the British Isles give first preference to the products of the Dominions. Australia and Canada will not be filled by sending out more farmers and sheep-breeders. That was not how the United States of America filled with population and became a Great Power. And they need more labour and development. All who go out there are unanimous about it. Recently, Mr. Robert Hornsby of Cumberland, the shorthorn cattle breeder, returned after a stay in Australia, during which he judged a

the centenary exhibition at Melbourne. On his way back he stopped in Palestine at the request of the High Commissioner to advise upon the most suitable breed of cattle for the Jewish settlements. And on his return he described Australia as "one of the richest countries in the world. The land calls for more labour and development."

Sir Thomas Buckland, the President of the Bank of New South Wales, said in his report to the last general meeting of the Bank, that

during the last two or three years a steady expansion in the volume of secondary production has occurred. There has been a remarkable improvement in the output of iron and steel. In addition to the increased sales of iron and steel products in Australia, an export trade in these products has been established. An indication of the increase in turnover of Australian factories is afforded by the consistent increase over the past three years in the sales of 42 large New South Wales factories. Marked activity is also apparent in the motor industry. Australian wholesale trade is slightly more active this year than in 1934. Indications point to a reasonable improvement in Australian retail trade this year compared with last year. One of the most hopeful signs of recovery is to be seen in the falling percentage of unemployed throughout the Commonwealth. The growth of employment in both factories and retail stores may be regarded as one of the most outstanding developments since the depression began. It is estimated that the numbers in employment have risen to the pre-depression level. This in itself justifies some feeling of optimism, but it must not be forgotten that an increase in population has to be accounted for, and it remains for this number (approximately 200,000 since 1931-2) to be absorbed before complete recovery can be claimed.

In New Zealand, too, Sir Thomas reported a considerable improvement in secondary production,

particularly in clothing, boot and shoe industries. The total output of secondary products for the year ended March 1935, was estimated to be from 10 per cent to 15 per cent greater than the previous year. Factory employment is higher, and some industries report a shortage of older apprentices and skilled workmen. Among the well-established industries, engineering shops, boot and shoe factories and textile mills are employing more hands or working overtime. There has been a substantial increase in wholesale trade this year. Sales of retail goods are reported to be higher this year than last year. In some quarters turnover is said to be almost 50 per cent larger than in 1934.

This, then, is the second aspect of the problem of the development of the Dominions on a large scale, to make them great countries of population, and powerful economic units of the British Empire.

Past experience has made the Dominions suspicious about the choice of settlers and their effect on the numbers of the unemployed. Responsible Ministers cannot shut their eyes to this danger. They are naturally afraid of adding to their problems. But the Australian Press has been making it clear recently that it is recognised that "a resumption of immigration is essential for Australia's safety." Only there must be assurances that the new settlers will not fall a burden on the State. And the new immigration must go in the direction of "promoting industrial expansion, making the immigrants self-supporting." Putting more people on the land will not do. City-bred settlers on the land have not made good in Australia. And "a large expansion of primary goods would find no assured new markets, and the Commonwealth can itself provide the agricultural labour it requires."

"A business-like scheme must be worked out," says one of the big Australian dailies. If that is done, "our sparsely populated Dominions are eager to have much larger populations."

As far back as 1851, Mr. John Hill Burton published with Chambers of Edinburgh a volume entitled *Emigration and its Practical Application*, in which he pointed out that one of the most important reasons for the development of America was

the uniformity with which mechanical and engineering and manufacturing enterprise keep up to the progress of population.

No plans for settlement and occupation of waste land will accomplish for Australia or Canada [he wrote], what the shipping, the railways, the roads, the bridges, the canals, the rapidly growing cities, with their water-pipes, gas works and harbours do to make the U.S. a field of never-failing enterprise.

When our colonies go forward with a like impulse, they will afford similar inducements to settlers. (Not only colonists, but also artisans, skilled workmen, traders, professional people, etc.) but not till then.

That was written at a time when the United States had a population of only about 25 million. It has increased in these eighty-five years nearly five-fold—it is now nearly 130 million—and by these same means. Within living memory, the mention of America conjured up wigwam and cabin, Redskins and Cowboys and the covered wagon. "Buffalo Bill" of the "Wild West" died as recently as 1917. Only seventy-five years ago, in 1860, Ruskin was writing about some Americans he had met :

What a dreadful thing it is that people should have to go to America again after coming to Europe! I think

America is a sort of United States of Probation, out of which all wise people, being once delivered, and having obtained entrance into this better world, should never be expected to return.

And that was nine or ten years after John Hill Burton had contrasted the inducements offered by America to settlers with the lack of enterprise in Australia or Canada, and the population of the United States had reached 25 million, a figure three or four times the present population of either Canada or Australia.

It was not only intellectuals like Ruskin who thought it was "a dreadful thing that people should have to go to America." Books and pamphlets were being issued in England, warning people not to go to America. In one of these publications, *Hints and Observations on the Disadvantages of Emigration to America* by "An Emigrant," "addressed principally to the working classes of England," the author declared :

My object in publishing the following observations has been occasioned by the various publications which have lately appeared in favour of emigration, whose only motive for deluding individuals into a desire to quit their native land is a certain percentage receivable from the owners of vessels destined to convey our countrymen from the British shores.

In 1852, there appeared in England an *Emigrants' Handbook*, which warned British people that

generally, the comparison between Britain and America is not considered favourable to the latter. The extreme heat of the summer, and cold of the winter, together with the excessive variation of temperature in the same day, render the States comparatively unhealthy.

It is odd, in view of this warning, to find that the people of the New England States at the very same time went in fear of the climatic conditions in California. In 1850, the Hon. T. Butler King presented a report on California to the Hon. John M. Clayton, Secretary of State, in which he writes: "In obedience to your instructions, I proceeded to California by way of the Isthmus of Panama." And he concludes his report with the following words:

We ought not to be surprised at the dislike which the immigrants in California frequently express to the climate. It is so unlike that from which they come that they cannot readily appreciate its advantages or become reconciled to its extremes of dry or wet.

The first attempts at American settlement were notoriously disastrous. The first settlers in Virginia, taken out by Sir Walter Raleigh, were enthusiastic about the country and the fertility of the soil, but their stores failed them before they reaped their harvest, and after ten months' residence they returned to England, with the assistance of Sir Francis Drake. As for the second lot of settlers, they made their way further inland, their stores gave out, and before they could be traced by the rescuers they perished miserably.

The Pilgrim Fathers during their first winter in America buried half their number, levelling the graves and sowing grain over them in the spring in order to conceal their misfortunes from the Indians. Pennsylvania, in the second half of the eighteenth century, still had to build forts to hold the Indians in check.

The struggle with nature has to be waged everywhere, to make conditions fit for human settlement. Europe

was not always the prosperous, healthy, fertile, industrialised Continent we know, with good roads, and spacious cities and fine architecture. There is a great deal being said now of the work of the Haluzim (Pioneers) in Palestine, draining swamps and turning unhealthy and unusable areas into fertile land. But it has been done everywhere. We sometimes forget how large a portion of a country like England has been reclaimed. It is true that some of the most important works go back for centuries, like the great embankments which guard Romney Marsh, probably of Roman origin. But much of it is more recent. In Holland, the fight against the sea is still being waged. The Zuyder Zee reclamation scheme is not yet completed. Fascist Italy has only just drained the Pontine marshes. And Poland is still considering the draining of the Polysian swamps.

So that there is nothing out of the common run of human experience in the pioneering hardships that were encountered in America in the early settlement days, and that would have to be encountered to-day in the uninviting parts of Australia and Canada. Nobody pretends that these countries are El Dorados. There are no such unnatural lands anywhere. All must be won by arduous labour. A year or two ago, "An Immigrant" published a book in London called *The Heart of an Immigrant*, describing "Life in Canada," which he knows, and after declaring very categorically that "there can be no denying the fact that within the boundaries of Canada there are vast tracts of land at present thinly populated or not populated at all that could support many millions of people," the author went on to suggest



that unemployment could be prevented in Canada for generations by the improving of roads not yet frost-proof, maintaining better roads in winter, and the making of new roads so as to open up the country for settlement later on.

That is true of all immigrant countries. It is what had to be done at first in America, too. Only in America, people foresaw it, and provided for it, and welcomed the tide of immigration that set in. New York claims to-day to be the biggest city in the world. London is its only rival. In 1853, about the time that Ruskin thought it was "a dreadful thing that people should have to go to America" and books were written *On the Disadvantages of Emigration to America*, Mr. John A. Dix, in an address to the New York Historical Society on the "Growth and Destinies of the City of New York," pointed out that

if the population of the city and the surrounding districts increases as rapidly during the next 28 years as it has during the last 25, it will number in 1865 a million and a half of souls, and in 1880 three millions. I see no reason [he went on] why there should be any check to this increase. The rapid improvement of the country, the extension of our commerce, the tide of immigration, all combine to accelerate its growth.

And the people who went there did not expect to find life a picnic. They went out in spite of all the warnings addressed to them, because they could not stay where they were, because they had to find new openings or perish. Except for a few adventurous spirits, those who were comfortably off at home stayed there. During the wave of emigration of 1847, it was stated that "All the Cork and Liverpool passengers are half-dead from starvation and want before em-

barking." Those were the people who built up the United States. And it is these people who will build up and populate the empty spaces of the Empire, if they are only given a chance.

Men and women of high capacities came and were born on the vast lands [writes Waldo Frank, in his book *Our America*]. It is true that at the outset many colonies were stocked with criminals and indentured servants. But it is yet to be proved that criminals lack their share of idealistic power, or that the unstable and poor are necessarily the weak. America, from the beginning, doubtless had her share of the salt of the earth. But the energy that parted the Atlantic and hewed the forests of a continent was wide enough and deep enough to engulf much of the idealistic forces of the individual swept in by the pioneering stream. The stride of America was fatefully economic. This uniformity of the American type is often overlooked. The mind reasons thus: Britain, France, Spain, Ireland, Germany rained their seed upon us. Therefore there could be no American type, but only Britons, Latins, Celts and Teutons. Nor can be until the years have made the compound. But take the Spaniard, and understand how the great winds of egress that blew him across the Ocean and the great blasts of adventure which blazed a trail with his body across mountain and prairie-land and desert worked upon his nature: made him at length a Spaniard no longer, but something else, something American. For the unchastened continent worked primitively and brutally upon its suitors. Catholic from France and Spain, Puritan and cavalier and demi-slave from England, burgher from Holland were moved by a common mastering impulse, were confronted by common mastering conditions, and they answered in common specific ways. They were the American pioneer. It is easy to understand how optimism should have become of the tissue of American life. The pioneer must hope. Else how can he press on? America was builded on a dream of fair lands: a dream that has come true.

Where are the pioneers and builders to come from now ? Primarily, of course, from Great Britain, from the several million unemployed in Great Britain. But not all of these would be suitable settlers, and not all would be willing to leave the British Isles. And, as already pointed out : " To populate the great empty spaces of the British Empire with the surplus population of only the British Isles is impossible." Even now, when immigration is at a standstill, without ever having reached anything like the dimensions of immigration in the United States, Canada is said to contain more than sixty nationalities—principally French, native Indians, Scottish, Irish, English, Dutch, Poles, Russians, Germans, Czechs, Italians, Chinese, Japanese, Syrians. And the population of Australia, though much more British in composition, contains a very large foreign element, and especially tens of thousands of Chinese and Japanese.

The British Empire is made up of all races and colours, and a quarter of mankind have within it been transmuted into British citizens, owing a common allegiance to the British Crown and the British Commonwealth of nations.

The Chief Rabbi, Dr. J. H. Hertz, has called attention to the fact that

British patriotism respects the personality of the ethnic groups found within the borders of its world-wide Dominion ; it fosters the individuality of Irishman and Welshman, of French Canadian and Afrikaner Boer, and encourages them to develop along their own lines. Anyone, therefore, who deems that patriotism exacts from him the purposeless sacrifice of his religious tradition and historic memory is alien in spirit to the Anglo-Saxon genius and is unworthy of his British citizenship.

What more shameful charge could be brought home against the Jewish population of this country—[says Sir Robert Waley Cohen] than that we had used the complete religious freedom which is given us here, not to rear up generations of English men and women inspired by the Jewish religion, but to rear up a population inspired by no spiritual message and thus constituting a dangerous pocket of materialism in the heart of the nation.

For "religion is the basis of society," as Burke said.

Many years ago, Sir Charles Dilke visited America, and wrote a book about what he had seen. And of the many people who were then streaming into the country, he wrote: "In America, the peoples of the world are being fused together, but they are run into an English mould: Alfred's laws and Chaucer's tongue are theirs, whether they would or no."

There is no reason why the filling of the empty spaces of the Empire should make the Dominions less British than they are. The *Economist*, in a special review of the Dominion of Canada, appearing in January 1936, tells us that by 1931 the proportion of people in Canada of extraneous stocks (neither basic British nor French) was roughly one-fifth, including nearly half a million Germans, 228,000 Scandinavians, 225,000 Ukrainians, 156,000 Jews, 148,000 Dutch and 145,000 Poles. But

the younger generation of these people [it adds] take kindly to anglicisation, and the danger once feared—that a series of racial enclaves would be created and prevent the development of a homogeneous society seems no longer to exist.

For another thing, Zangwill once employed the phrase "United Cultural States of America" to describe the ultimate result of the Melting Pot, and

the so-called Americanisation process. We may speak of something of the same kind in respect of British civilisation. Sir Arthur Keith has seen it happening in the United States. "The people of the United States of America have been recruited from all the countries and races of Europe," he writes. "Yet in mind they have become 100 per cent American." President Theodore Roosevelt, the spokesman of virile Americanism, said :

Americanism is a question of principle, of idealism, of character ; it is not a matter of birthplace, or creed or line of descent. Here in this country the representatives of many old-world races are being fused together into a new type.

And as George Eliot reminded us, there was " a time of national mixture when modern Europe, too, was a-brewing." " Saxon, or Dane or Norman we, Teuton or Celt, or whatever we be." As Defoe sang : " Thus from a mixture of all kinds began that heterogeneous thing, an Englishman." There may even be something in the Anglo-Israelite theory, to add to the mixture. According to Bagehot, it is the " forces of imitation and elimination " which were

the main ones in the formation of national character. We all know how a kind of subtle influence makes us imitate or try to imitate the manner of those around us. To conform to the fashion of Rome—whatever the fashion may be, and whatever Rome we may for the time be at—is among the most obvious needs of human nature.

When the Huguenots, for instance, took refuge in England, they became in a generation indistinguishable from Englishmen. And that is only one instance of

many. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch has said: "Pict, Dane, Frisian, Huguenot-French and others came in. If mixture of blood be a shame, we have purchased at the price of that shame the glory of catholicism." And no matter what the Hitlerist race-theory may claim, the same holds true of most nations. "There is no more mixed race than the Germans, and the majority of its greatest sons have not been Nordic," said Count Keyserling, the philosopher of the Darmstadt School of Wisdom, who has nevertheless accepted Nazism, because "it must not be judged by its attacks on the Jews, but by its significance to Germany."

That brings us to the third aspect of the problem. In all the countries of Europe there is at present a very acute congestion of population, and there is no outlet to draw it off. Not very many years ago, Englishmen, Scotsmen, Irishmen, Germans, Italians, Frenchmen, Poles, Czechs, Russians, Scandinavians, and others, including millions of Jews, were able to emigrate to the United States of America, and help in the development of the country. To-day this outlet is closed. The United States are thought to have filled sufficiently. So there are many thousands of surplus population in these European countries, bottled up and stewing in their own juice, so to speak. It is not difficult to assume that much of the exaggerated economic nationalism in some of these countries is directly attributable to this state of affairs. If it should prove possible to draw off some of this surplus population into the emptier parts of the globe, where opportunities of development exist, it would probably do more to ease the present world-tension and to restore equilibrium than any other conceivable measure.

Tolerance is the corollary of ease. It is most unlikely to accompany cramped irritation.

A very grave irritant in present-day Europe is the existence of the so-called Jewish question. In Germany, the antisemitic policy of the Hitlerist Government has resulted in the degradation and economic displacement of nearly half a million Jews. In Poland and in other East European countries the emergence of a new middle class of shopkeepers, professionals and artisans has ruined half the Jewish population, and there are consequently millions of Jews who are doomed to die of starvation unless they can find new economic openings in other countries.

## CHAPTER II

### THE JEWS ARE NOT A WANDERING PEOPLE

ONE hears a great deal of the supposed migratory habits of the Jews. People talk as if the Jews were habitual vagrants, gypsies, nomadic "tribes of the wandering foot and weary breast." But the truth is that Jews do not at all want to wander. There is, in fact, no group of people more attached to their native soil than the Jews. In Germany, the Jews have been continuously resident in the country since at least the year 320 and probably much longer, for at least 1,600 years. "My forbears," said one famous German Jew, the novelist, Jacob Wassermann, "have dwelt in Frankish territory for at least 500 years, and I should like to discover how many of the so-called autochthonous Germans, Saxons, Pommeranians, French-Brandenburgian immigrants could make a similar claim." Professor Ismar Elbogen, in his new *History of the Jews in Germany*, recalls that in Worms, Regensburg, Ulm and elsewhere in Swabia, Jews are said to have been settled there three hundred years before the common era. All along the Danube and the Rhine, wherever the Romans had their fortified camps, there were colonies of Jews. When hundreds of thousands of Jews were sold into slavery after the



conquest of Palestine by Titus, many of them were brought to Germany, including women who bore children to their masters.

The Jews [he writes] lived as Roman citizens, with all their duties, privileges and opportunities of activity. The first unassailable record of the existence of a Jewish community on German soil comes from the beginning of the fourth century. There were in Cologne a large number of Jews, with an organised community, with "Priests, synagogue fathers," and other officials. There were Jews who owned land, and could be civic dignitaries.

There were early Jewish settlements also in Trèves, Metz, Regensburg, Mayence, Worms and elsewhere. There are legends in Regensburg that Jews lived there among the heathen three centuries before the Christian era, and in Worms Jews are said to have lived there at the time Ezra issued his call to return, and that they preferred to stay by the Rhine. "As in the rest of the Roman Empire, they could not only trade, but were also artisans, and cultivated their fields, orchards and vineyards." "Since they settled here in Roman days, there have always been Jews living in Germany. They have experienced good times and bad." "Christianity," Professor Elbogen adds, "took firm root very quickly in Trèves—which generally presupposes the existence of a Jewish community. In 350, a Bishop of Jewish birth named Simeon was appointed in Metz." "Charlemagne sent a Jew with his mission to Haroun al Rashid in Bagdad."

The Jews lived in their own streets, but not segregated from the rest of the population. The towns were too small for that, and the Jewish districts too close to the centre, the harbour and the market-place. The people

lived in friendly, neighbourly relations with the Jews. Many successful efforts were made to convert Jews to Christianity, and the Christian world was shocked when Christian priests like Bodo in 837, or Wezelin, the court chaplain of Emperor Henry II in 1010 adopted Judaism. There was no economic rivalry between Jews and Christians. Every inhabitant of the town was at one and the same time farmer, merchant and artisan, and a community of interest grew up between Jewish and Christian residents. Into this favourable development there burst out of the clear sky the thunderbolt of 1096.

This was the year of the massacres by the Crusaders : " We are setting out on a long and arduous road to win the Holy Sepulchre, and here, in our midst, live those who killed the Saviour ! " " The Crusaders wore on their breasts the Cross—and wore it in the very act of massacre," says a Christian writer, Mr. Basil Mathews, of the Y.M.C.A. The massacres and persecutions went on for centuries. " How could people live in this atmosphere of lies, hatred and murder ? " Professor Elobogen asks. " How could they stay in or return to the infernos in which such inhuman sufferings were inflicted on them ? " But in spite of everything, " a considerable part of German Jewry—none too large after the slaughter of 1348-1350—remained in the country. The Jews never completely left Germany."

Now again, the *C. V.-Zeitung*, one of the two chief organs of the Jews of Germany, writes :

The first condition is to have faith and trust. For the future is with God, Who is not tied to statistical calculations. With confidence in the illimitability of the future, which no one can take from us, and with the hope that our community will again be built up here from a " remnant," we carry on the work for German Jewry. We

believe that, if God bless it, this work can succeed, and we contest the statistics that would predict the extinction of German Jewry. Yet we cannot say simply—"stay in Germany," much though we want to preserve German Jewry. We must see to it that those who can remain in Germany should remain here. And whoever cannot remain we must help in his decision to abandon his dear homeland. We must look the facts soberly in the face—for a course of years emigration is unavoidable. Our love for Germany is a natural instinct, not a political formula. But the determination to remain in Germany as a lost host is a political decision.

To withdraw from a State in which we are even persecuted is to abandon our claim to those natural human rights to which every unit in each State is entitled, and from which he is only excluded through the operations of false views and of demented philosophy [Oswald John Simon wrote in the *Nineteenth Century* in 1898].

There is a widespread belief that before Emancipation came, the Jews lived in enforced Ghettos, and were outside the law. Professor Salo Baron points out that when it is said that pre-Emancipation Jews did not have "equal rights," it does not mean that they were the subject of special discrimination.

The simple fact is that there was no such thing as "equal rights." The enormous mass of peasants were little more than appurtenances of the soil on which they were born. When the land was sold they were included in the sale. None could move away without the master's consent. In contrast with this class, the Jews were well-off. The disabilities under which medieval Jewry suffered have been made much of. Jews could not own land or join most of the guilds, and were thereby effectively barred from certain branches of craft and commerce. But these were, in legal theory, restrictions made on the privileges granted them, and not limitations on any general rule of equal

rights. Every corporation had similar restrictions, and in this respect the Jews were in no different position in principle than other privileged groups. True, the Jews were *servi camerae* (servants of the Treasury), but this status can neither in theory nor in practice be compared with that of the peasants, who were serfs of their local masters. If one may introduce a modern legal distinction not thoroughly applicable to medieval conditions, this difference becomes clear. The peasants were really serfs in civil law, that is, they belonged to a private owner as a kind of private property. The Jews were, so to speak, serfs in public law, and as such belonged to the ruler as representative or embodiment of the State, and they were inherited by his successor in office through public law. The man elected to the Imperial throne was their master, and not the private heir of the former Emperor's private estates, or the heir even of those German countries which, like Austria, he could claim on dynastic grounds. Now we ought not to forget that even to-day we are, in effect, serfs of the State in public law, notwithstanding all theories of personal rights, natural rights of citizens, and the sovereignty of the people. In fact, even more so to-day than formerly. The State can levy taxes little short of confiscatory ; it can send us to war ; in democratic countries, and even more so in Fascist Italy or Soviet Russia, it is complete master of all lives and property. This situation, expressed in medieval terminology, is a serf relationship applying to all citizens. The Jew then, insofar as he was *servus camerae*, was in substantially the same position all modern free citizens are in. In a word, the difference in the legal status between Jew and peasant was what David Hume, writing in that period on the condition of ancient slaves, called the difference between "domestic slavery" and "civil subjection." The first, he recognised, is "more cruel and oppressive than any civil subjection whatsoever."

A phase of this corporate existence generally regarded by emancipated Jewry as an unmitigated evil was the Ghetto [Professor Baron continues]. But it must not be

forgotten that the Ghetto grew up voluntarily as a result of Jewish self-government, and it was only in a later development that public law interfered and made it a legal compulsion for *all* Jews to live in a secluded district in which no Christian was allowed to dwell. To a certain extent the Ghetto in this technical sense was a fruit of the counter-Reformation, having its origin in Pope Paul IV's Bull, *Cum nimis absurdam*, issued against the Jews in 1555, and in its extreme application it was, of course, obnoxious. In origin, however, the Ghetto was an institution that the Jews had found it to their interest to create themselves. Various corporations in the State had separate streets of their own; the shoemakers, for example, or the bakers, would live each in one neighbourhood. In addition to their growing mutual interest as a corporation of money dealers, the Jews wished to be near the Synagogue, then a social as well as a religious centre. Furthermore, they saw in the Ghetto a means of defence. Thus, it was the Jews themselves who secured from Bishop Rudiger in Spire in 1084 the right to settle in a separate district and to erect a wall around it. There were locks inside the Ghetto gates in most cases before there were locks outside. The Ghetto, in the non-technical sense, was then a district in which most Jews and few Gentiles lived long before the legal compulsion which came when Christian authority found it necessary to mark the Jews off by residence district, in order to prevent complete social intercourse between them and Christians. Compared with the advantages, social exclusion from the Gentile world was hardly a calamity. Indeed, to most Jews it was welcome, and the Ghetto found warm champions in every age. There the Jews might live in comparative peace, interrupted less by pogroms than were peasants by wars, engaged in finance and trade at least as profitable as most urban occupations, free to worship, and subject to the Inquisition only in extreme situations (as after the enforced baptisms in Spain and Portugal). They had no political rights, of course, but except for nobles and clergy no one did.

In England, the Jews do not go back so far as in

Germany, but, says Dr. Stokes, " the Jews came into England with the Conqueror," which is a title to nobility.

There are, indeed, rumours [he continues] of their presence here now and then in Anglo-Saxon times ; but the evidence of this is too vague to be accepted. William I brought them from Rouen and settled them in various towns in his new dominions, and during his reign they gradually prospered. They were still more favoured by William II. Referring to a controversy between some clerics and some Israelites, the Red King is said to have declared : " By the face of St. Luke, if the Jews overcome the Christians, he himself would become one of their sect."

It has been suggested, without, of course, anything to go upon, that his mysterious death in the New Forest may have been due to fear that he might make good his threat to turn Jew. Dr. Stokes traces the history of the Jews in England through the reigns of Henry I, Henry II, Richard I, King John and Henry III, the latter of whom " was interested in them from a religious point of view, and in 1232 established the ' Domus Conversorum ' for the reception of some who embraced Christianity." " The accession of Richard I (the Crusades) was a landmark in the troubles of Israel. The persecuting spirit spread throughout the country, a terrible slaughter, for instance, occurring in York." After the death of Henry III, his son succeeded him as Edward I, and in his reign, in the year 1290, long before the expulsion from Spain, an order was issued for the expulsion of all Jews from England, and in the autumn of that year a compulsory exodus took place, and so, after two centuries and more, it became illegal for any unconverted Israelite to sojourn in England. " Not from the days of Edward I till

Cromwell's time were Jews knowingly permitted to reside in this realm."

But Jews were nevertheless continuously resident in England, and not only in the *Domus Conversorum*, which existed till the time of James I, and no doubt they had some connection, as consultants, with the forty-seven who produced the majestic miracle of the James I Bible. At any rate, they used earlier translations, and among others they probably utilised the Latin translation from the Hebrew which Tremellius published, partly in London (in 1580).

Lucien Wolf and other scholars have produced proof of their residence, notwithstanding the edict of expulsion. In his very important address printed in the *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, 1924-7, Lucien Wolf points to the fact that

between the years 1880 and 1888 the late Sir Sidney Lee inaugurated the renascence of Anglo-Jewish historical study by his researches into the middle period of Anglo-Jewish history—that is the obscure period between the expulsion of the Jews by Edward I in 1290 and their readmission by Oliver Cromwell in 1655. He gave special attention to the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and he argued, not unreasonably, that there must have been a considerable number of Jews in England at that period. Sir Sidney Lee's conjecture was shrewdly founded and it has been abundantly justified. There was quite a goodly company of Jews in England throughout the reign of Elizabeth and they played a not unimportant part in the commerce and public affairs of those spacious days.

Rev. Michael Adler, who has devoted himself to researches into the history of the *Domus Conversorum*, states that "its records afford testimony of the steady stream of Jews into England. in spite of the edict of

expulsion. A few of these persons allowed themselves to be baptised." At the time of the expulsion there were eighty converts in the Domus, and over sixty years after the expulsion, in 1353, there was still in the Domus a woman, Claricia of Exeter, who had been admitted several years before the expulsion.

Rev. Adler notes that Thomas Cromwell, the vicar-general of Henry VIII (Shakespeare's Cromwell), was a warden of the Domus and lived there. Joseph Jacobs mentions among the distinguished Jews who lived in England after the expulsion Tremellius, who was a friend of Archbishop Cranmer and resided with him at Lambeth Palace. He was in 1549 Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge. A convert to Protestantism, he translated Calvin's "Catechism" into Hebrew. He also speaks of Jacob Barnett, a Hebrew teacher at Oxford about 1613, who refused to be baptised. Dr. Israel Abrahams writes of Joachim Gans, or Gannse, a mining expert who figures in the English State papers of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. He introduced a new process for the "making of copper, vitriall and coppis and smeltinge of copper and lead ures." In September, 1589, Gans proclaimed himself a Jew, and as a result was arrested and sent to the Privy Council. But "the council seems to have taken no hostile action." When Menasseh Ben Israel came to petition Cromwell for the readmission of the Jews, the Crypto-Jews who had been worshipping in a secret Synagogue in Cree Church Lane, Leadenhall Street, joined him in his appeal. Dr. Cecil Roth writes of them that "refugees from the fires of the Inquisition they were happy enough to be sure of their lives and to be able to practise whatever of Judaism they desired



n private without disturbance." The late H. S. Q. Henriques, K.C., who was President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews and of the Jewish Historical Society of England, writing of the status of the English Jews, said that

the factor conducing to the present flourishing condition of the Jews in England is that they have never persisted in claiming for themselves a separate national status. Thus in their ordinary daily life, both in their dealings with each other and the outside community, the Jews in England have followed the law of the land and not the Mosaic code—questions of inheritance, marriage, divorce, etc., being regulated by English law; the only special privileges accorded to Jews, apart from certain concessions in respect to working on Sunday, being that in respect of their marriages, so far as ceremonies only are concerned they have been allowed to follow their own usage. The Jews in England thus came to look upon themselves and to be regarded by their neighbours as members of a distinct religious sect, but not as belonging to a separate national entity. Accordingly, in the Acts of Parliament granting them the privileges which have enabled them to obtain complete equality with their fellow-citizens, they are uniformly described not as Jews but as "persons professing the Jewish religion." There is no incongruity in a Jew, if he has the rights of a British subject proclaiming himself an Englishman, though it might perhaps be more accurate to assume the name of British—but that is a grievance of ancient standing nursed by the Scots ever since the Act of Union of the two kingdoms. He owes allegiance to the English throne, and allegiance being one and indivisible, to no other country, and has every reason to be proud of his British nationality. He has equal reason to be proud of his Jewish religion, and every cause to be grateful that the country whose nationality he possesses has for generations accorded complete toleration to that religion. So long as that policy is maintained there can be no question of any one of us being an Englishman first and a Jew after-

wards, or vice versa. The spheres of politics and religion can be kept distinct, and each one of us can be an Englishman first and a Jew first at one and the same time. In the Anglo-Jewish Community there is ample room for differences of opinion, East End and West End, Zionist and non-Zionist, Orthodox and Reform, but there is no room for disloyalty to this country. That would be in conflict with the precept laid down by our sages to seek the good of the State in which we dwell, and therefore treason to the cause of Israel.

Of the Jews of Russia, Professor Dubnov, the Russo-Jewish historian, writes :

If there is any place at all in Europe where the Jews can fully claim the name of autochthones, it is the whole of the northern coast-line of the Black Sea, the Crimea and the whole coastal region from Odessa to the Caucasus. Scientifically well-authenticated inscriptions prove that in the first century of the Christian era there were well-organised communities of Hellenistic Jews in the Bosphorus Empire. Upon this ancient layer of Jewish agricultural population more and more layers accumulated in the course of centuries—the Byzantine Jews of the Fifth Century, the Jews of the Chazar Empire, between the Eighth and Eleventh Centuries (the Chazars had Judaised), the Jews and the Karaite Jews of the period of Tartar domination between the Thirteenth and Eighteenth Centuries, and finally a network of Jewish agricultural settlers in the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. Eastern Europe, beginning with Alexander the Great, received its immigrants from the ancient lands of Hellenised Asia, while the immigration into Western Europe proceeded in the main from the Roman Empire. Among the ancient Jewish settlements the colonies situated on the northern shores of the Black Sea, now forming part of Russia, occupy a prominent place.

It is very probable that Kiev, "the mother of Russian cities," was built by the Jewish Chazars. When

it was taken by the Russian Grand Duke Vladimir, he found a large Jewish Community there. Prince Mirsky, in his *History of Russia*, speaks of Vladimir's father destroying the Chazar kingdom. When Russia celebrated the thousandth anniversary of the founding of Kiev, the Jews in an address pointed out that Jews had lived in Russia before the Empire was founded.

Information concerning the Jews of pre-Christian Poland has come down to us in the shape of hazy legends [Professor Dubnov writes]. These obscure tales contain a germ of historic truth, in that they indicate the existence of Jewish settlements in pagan Poland. The propagation of Latin Christianity in Poland beginning with 966, which placed the country under the control not only of the emperors of Germany but also of its bishops as the representatives of the Roman See, was bound to stimulate intercourse between the two countries and result in an increased influx of Jewish merchants and settlers. As a result of the Crusades, the severe Jewish persecutions in Germany during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries drove vast numbers of Jews into Poland. Prompted by the desire to cultivate industrial activities in their dominions, the Polish princes gladly welcomed settlers from Germany, without making distinctions between Jews and Christians. In a land which had not yet emerged from the primitive stage of agricultural economy, and possessed only two fixed classes, owners of the soil and tillers of the soil, the Jews naturally represented the "third estate," acting as the pioneers of trade.

Mr. Simon Marks, who with Viscount Bearsted and Sir Herbert Samuel, recently formed the Anglo-Jewish Mission to America, to seek the co-operation of American Jewry in raising a fund of £3,000,000 which envisages transplanting 100,000 Jews from Germany to Palestine and elsewhere, presided a couple of years ago at a dinner given by the Federation of Polish Jews

in England to the retiring Polish Ambassador, M. Skirmunt.

The Jews have a continuous history in Poland of over a thousand years [he said]. As far back as the eleventh century, there were large Jewish Communities in Cracow, Posen, Kalisz and Silesia. In 1267 Prince Boleslas the Pious gave privileges to the Jews, establishing their autonomy. The Edict of August 13th, 1551, the Magna Charta of Jewish self-Government in Poland, heralded the glorious period of Jewish life in that country which lasted until the middle of the seventeenth century. They were not tied down to moneylending or petty trade; they were actively engaged in various industries as producers and manufacturers. They were frequently employed as financial agents for the Crown, administered large estates, worked the salt mines and exported agrarian products beyond the border.

Fact and legend have been interwoven to make over three million Jews regard Poland as their fatherland, and they have had their roots in the country as long as or longer than other sections of the population. It was a catastrophe not only for Poles, but for Jews, when the partitions of Poland took place. For the Poles it meant an uprooting of their political, social and institutional life. The greatest part of their territory was subjected to oppressive governments. For the Jews it meant a tragic change by which they lost their accustomed rights and which broke up their highly developed communal organisation. The restoration of Poland was a measure of the Peace Treaties which met with general approval. Left free to develop her own economic and cultural life, it was felt that the new Poland, now a nation of over 30,000,000, would make for stability and enlightenment in the heart of Europe. There was the hope that all those who form its population would have the opportunity of helping to build up their country. The reconstruction of a country is difficult enough even under favourable conditions. It was unfortunate, however, that in common with other

---

countries Poland so soon had to meet the economic blizzard of a world crisis. The fall in the prices of commodities, and especially of agricultural products, severely strained the economic life of the country. In addition, the stoppage of emigration was a hard blow to Poland, from whose territory there had hitherto been a steady exodus. We must all in common justice, recognise the difficulties with which the Government of Poland was faced, difficulties peculiarly great for a Government engaged in building up a new State. Here, in this gathering, our concern is with the reaction of these forces upon our brethren in Poland, who had suffered extremely in the Great War and shared the common hopes of the Peace in the restored Poland.

The Ambassador, M. Skirmunt, a former Foreign Minister, said in his reply :

I hope that the days to come will be better for you and for us. We can progress only on the basis of peace. The Polish Government has the most sympathetic outlook on the building of the Palestine State, the building of your National Home. Every year Poland has an additional 50,000 Jews, because the Jewish population is very prolific ; it has to be found an outlet. If the Jews have a National Home, if a certain number can emigrate to it, we can only help them. Responsible people in Poland look upon the Jewish population as equal citizens, enjoying the same rights as the Poles themselves. If they can be happy there I wish them nothing else.

Dr. Schipper, the historian of Polish Jewry, has shown that

in Kosciuszko's rising, immediately after the last Partition, Jews were already in the Polish Liberation Army. And in every subsequent battle for Polish independence Jews fought and fell, right up till the last final consummation of Polish freedom. There are records of the early seventeenth century of Jews defending Polish towns as armed soldiers. In Rzeszow, the Jews were led in 1627

by a Jewish Hetman, Moses Hefter. While Poland had to wage war against Cossacks, Tartars and Swedes, the Jews, according to the chronicles of Yavon Mecula, fought heroically in the defence of Tulczyn, Niemirov, Polone and Narole. A Legion of 1,000 Jewish soldiers fought with the Polish army. Many synagogues on the frontiers still resemble forts more than synagogues (in Lutzk, Solkiew, Lubomil, Tarnopol and Szarogorod). In Kosciuszko's rising, Jewish volunteers came from all parts of the country, in response to his appeal in the old Cracow synagogue. Two young Jews, Berek Joselowicz and Joseph Aronowicz, raised a Jewish legion, which was wiped out in the defence of the Warsaw suburb Praga, on November 4th, 1794. "The Warsaw Jews," said Kosciuszko in his order of the day to the army, "have shown the world that they do not spare their blood for the cause of human liberty." In the rising of 1830-1, the Jews again rallied to the Polish flag. Joseph Berkowicz, the son of Berek Joselowicz, drew up a plan of a Jewish legion which was accepted by General Chlopicki. Ostrowski, the Commander of the National Guards, pays tribute in his memoirs to the bravery of the Warsaw Jews: "They were in every division under fire. Many Jews received crosses. I spoke with many officers and all assured me that the Jews bore themselves worthily. They behaved like old, experienced soldiers."

Destiny has linked us with the Polish nation for all times [writes Sholem Asch], and our hopes are that we may both go together along the common road—to a bright future. We believe in the fundamental sound instincts of the Polish soul, which have manifested themselves in relation to us Jews in the course of our long history in Poland, in those noble and humane ideas by means of which the great spirits of Poland kept her alive during the years of her enslavement and brought her out into the light of day.

So, too, despite centuries of persecution and pogroms in Germany, the Jews clung tenaciously to their native land. To-day still, there are large numbers of Jews

in Germany who will not, under any circumstances, leave Germany. They will rather die there. In the war we were ready to give our blood for Germany, they say. If Germany wants our blood now, we shall give it, even if we are immolated on the altar this time amid cries of execration, and not of approbation, as in the war. Of course, there are many who would seek refuge and peace elsewhere. But despite Hitlerism, there are many Jews in Germany who will remain there whatever happens.

From Russia, at the time of the pogroms, fifty years ago, great numbers of Jews fled to America, to England and other countries. According to the American Jewish Year Book for 1935, the number of Jews who came into the United States of America as immigrants in the fifty-three years from 1881 to 1933 was 2,335,559. But the territory which was at the time of the pogroms the Russian Empire still contains the largest Jewish population in the world. The Soviet Union has a Jewish population of about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million. Poland has nearly  $3\frac{1}{2}$  million. And Lithuania and Latvia and Bessarabia (which now is Roumanian) have a Jewish population of about 350,000. This makes a total of nearly  $6\frac{1}{2}$  million people. The United States of America, which has the second-largest Jewish population in the world, has  $4\frac{1}{2}$  million Jews.

There were vast numbers of Russian Jews at the height of the emigration to America who refused to leave Russia. They loved the land, and could not bear to go from it. Soon after the Kishinev pogrom, and while a committee of Governors and high officials was engaged in systematising the anti-Jewish code of laws, its labours were interrupted by the outbreak of

the Russo-Japanese War. The official organ of Russian Jewry wrote :

Let us endeavour to forget the recent expulsion from Port Arthur, the pogroms of Kishinev and Homel, and many, many other things. The Jews will go into battle, as plain soldiers, without hope of attaining officer's rank or distinctions—the blood of our sons will flow as freely as that of other Russians.

The Jews [writes Professor Dubnov] marched to the Far East to assist Russia in making the province of Manchuria part of Siberia, in which they were forbidden to reside. The number of Jews at the front was disproportionately large—it amounted to some thirty thousand. While thousands of disfranchised Jews were fighting for the prestige of Russia in the Far East, the whip of rightlessness did not cease to lash their brethren at home. In a number of places the authorities began to expel the families of the soldiers and the physicians who had been sent to the war, on the ground that with the departure of the head of the family the wife and children had forfeited the right of residence.

And when the Great War broke out ten years later, “the Russian Jews, yet reeking from the blood of a hundred pogroms, threw themselves into Russia's struggle with almost frenzied fervour,” as Zangwill has said.

It would be easy to dismiss the enthusiasm of the Russian Jews as more politic than patriotic, or to say that they have made a virtue of necessity [he went on]. But it bears all the marks of a sincere upwelling, a spiritual out-reaching to their fellow-Russians. Such scenes as marked the proclamation of war had never been known in Russian Jewry. From the Great Synagogue in Petersburg 5,000 Jews, headed by the Crown Rabbi, marched to the Czar's Palace and sang Hebrew hymns and the Russian anthem. Similar demonstrations occurred wherever Jews dwelt.



The *Voschod*, the leading Jewish paper in Russia at that time, wrote early in 1914 :

We were born and brought up in Russia. Our ancestors are buried here. We Russian Jews are bound to Russia by ties which cannot be broken. We, the Jews of Russia, are united inseparably with the country in which we have dwelt for centuries, and from which neither persecution nor oppression can tear us away.

Germany's aeroplanes rained down on the Jewish Pale not bombs, but leaflets, announcing herself the deliverer of the oppressed Jews. Ludendorff himself signed the proclamation :

Our armies have forced the despotic Russian Government to flee. Our banners bring you Jews rights and liberty, equal citizen rights, liberty of religion, freedom to work in all branches of economic and cultural life. We come to you as friends. Jews are to have equal rights, built up on a firm foundation. Remember the expulsions, how Jews were driven from their homes. Remember Kishinev, Homel, Bialystock, Siedlice, and hundreds of other pogroms. Remember the Beilis trial and the work of the barbarous Government to spread the horrible lie of blood being used by Jews. Think of all the restrictive laws against you. The doors to life have been banged to against the Jews. Help us to liberate you. Trust our commanders. Prepare the way for the victory of liberty and justice !

To these seductive attempts to exploit Jewish resentment, the famous Jewish novelist, Sholem Asch, answered :

The Jews are marching in the Russian ranks for the defence of their Fatherland. Thousands of Russo-Jewish volunteers have enlisted in France. Even from America, where Germany has tried to exploit our sufferings, they are beginning to come. For this is not a war to defend

the Russian bureaucracy which is responsible for the pogroms, but to defend the integrity of our Fatherland, because deep in our hearts there is burning love of Russia. No restrictions, no pogroms can efface this natural feeling of love for our country, thank God! We have been in Russia as long as the Slav peoples. The history of the Jews in Poland begins with the first page of Polish history. For a thousand years and more we have absorbed into our blood the sap of the Slav soil; the Slav landscape is reflected in our thought and imagination. We shall fight against the system of Government which refuses to recognise our equality. But the Russian soil is sacred, it belongs to the peoples of Russia, and whoever dares to touch it will find in the Jew his first foe!

These six millions of Jews are Russia's body and soul [Zangwill wrote]. They love the soil which they have inhabited for centuries—in some cases longer than the "true-born Russians." They ask nothing better than to live and die for "Mother Russia," and if the still more ancient "Mother Zion" has been invoked these latter days, it was from sheer hopelessness of ever being treated as children of Russia. Equal rights for the Jew—or even equal wrongs with the Russian—would indeed bring a problem—but for the Jew: the problem of his dissolution in the melting pot of common citizenship. But to the Russian this enfranchisement of the Jew would be the solution, not the establishment, of a problem.

So that it was not because of resentment at Russian oppression, in order to escape from the pogroms, that millions of Russian Jews went to America and elsewhere. Many, no doubt, did. But the great mass of them more likely went for the same reason that millions of Irishmen, Germans, Italians, Scandinavians and non-Jewish Russians and Poles went to America—because it was a land of opportunity, empty territory that was rapidly developing and needed labour. And

the proportion of Russian Jews who went was probably no larger than the proportion of other immigrants. (The number of Englishmen who emigrated to the United States of America in less than thirty years—from 1899 to 1927—was about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  million, to which must be added another million Irishmen and half a million Scotsmen.) The bulk of the Russian Jews remained in Russia, despite discrimination, persecution and pogroms.

So, to-day, it is no wholesale exodus of the entire Jewish populations of Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Roumania, Austria or Germany that is contemplated or possible or desired by those Jewish populations, whatever a few panic-stricken folk or a few sensationalist journalists say. "Is it not a trifle foolish," Mr. R. D. Blumenfeld has asked, "to think and talk of evacuating Germany of all its Jews? It is an impossible suggestion." Even Hitler, even Julius Streicher, do not expect it. Else they would not have their elaborate "Jew-legislation," to regulate the life of the Jews in Nazi Germany. Their life under that legislation will not be very pleasant, but it has happened before to Jews in Germany, and they stuck it out. One Nazi spokesman has just told us that there will be no expulsion of all Jews from Germany, because then there would be no Jews from whom the people would learn to know the Jewish question, and soon, ignorant of what Jews are, they would invite the Jews back on the old terms. I have already quoted the "C. V.-Zeitung," that contests the statistical calculations "that would predict the extinction of German Jewry," and its trust "that our community will again be built up here from a remnant." However permanent the

conditions in Germany to-day may seem, we know that such things never remain permanent. Bismarckian and "Kaiser Bill" Germany passed, as Cromwellian England and Napoleonic France and Czarist Russia and Garibaldian Italy have passed. History is always in a state of ebb and flow. The things that hurt or benefit Jews are naturally terribly important to Jews, but we must not judge the whole world by that standard. Besides, there was more than the Jewish question behind even the antisemitism in Germany. After the French defeat in 1871, there was a similar outburst of antisemitism in France, that was at bottom the uprising of humiliated national pride, seeking in the same way to find its vindication in a "great Jewish conspiracy to deliver France to the enemy." Even the stubborn French patriotism of the Alsatian Jews, who refused to remain in Alsace under German rule and wandered into the interior of France, created prejudice and hostility by their Germanic guttural French and their Germanic manners. Dreyfus himself belonged to one of these Alsatian Jewish families. Madison Peters, in his book *Justice to the Jew*, quotes an article that appeared in the London *Spectator* in January 1899:

Is there to be a New St. Bartholomew? : Not only does M. Drumont, in the *Libre Parole*, a paper which, we believe, circulates by the half-million daily, incite the mob to attack the Jews, but a number of other papers, some of which, we deeply regret to say, profess a religious complexion, hound on the mob to what is, in fact, massacre. No doubt Frenchmen are excitable and mean less by violent talk than Englishmen. When they talk of it being necessary that blood should flow they do not always mean murder. At the same time, we cannot forget that history has always

shown that in France vile words are often the precursors of vile deeds.

Ernst Glaeser, in his new novel, *The Last Civilian*, has an ex-officer storm-troop leader who was in the war, telling his young Nazi friend who was a child during the war :

This is no peace, but a lost war. We were children, and then we became soldiers, and soldiers we have remained. Your generation likewise goes straight from childhood to war. Obey ! One man does the thinking for us. Our only duty when he summons is to arise.

And that it is war, explains also the attitude to the Jews :

When I went to the war, it wasn't the Marxists and the Jews, but the French and the English, whom I had to shoot at. My father had friends in France and in England, and excellent people they were. But what difference did that make ? When I put on my field-grey, all my scruples fell away. I no longer thought of justice. I was a soldier. Beat down the feelings inside you. Let your heart be cold. Do not look at the wreckage that must strew our path. The end is greater than the injustice we must do.

Feuchtwanger put it another way : " They shouted, first ' Down with the English ! ' ; then ' Down with the profiteers ! ' ; then ' Down with the Government ! ' ; at present they are shouting ' Down with the Jews ! ' " " It will soon blow over," he adds. I am not so sure that it will blow over soon. But one day it will blow over, as everything does. The German Jewish organisations warned the Jews of Germany at the beginning not to run away. Better to face it out in Germany, they said, even if it means annihilation for many of

us, than run abroad and perish there just the same, away from home, away from kin.

Whether we have less rights or more rights in our homeland, it still is our homeland—we belong here, and we love our homeland as much as ever we did, no matter how we are treated. We are German Jews [they said] and we will not be driven out of Germany. That is the solution of our problem.

Is it so impossible for us who love the Thames, the Hudson, the Seine, or the Jordan, the rivers that run through our hearts, that are our life-streams, to understand the feeling of a German Jew who longs to see the Rhine?

It is all very well to sneer at German Jews for standing by their country in spite of persecution and humiliation. But what else can human nature do? Patriotism is at bottom love of a particular part of one's country with which one's innermost memories are bound up. Because a man is a Jew does he feel these things less intensely? People do not suddenly turn their backs on the habits and memories of a lifetime because things have gone wrong. The very use of the term exile for those who, feeling that they can stand no more, make the wrench, is expressive of the uprooting that it involves. There are those who would rather die at home than live abroad. I can well understand them. There is such a thing as not knowing when one is not wanted, and most people when they find things unpleasant for them go where they can feel more comfortable, whether they are Jews or Irish, Italians, Huguenots, persecuted Catholics, or Doukhobors. But there is such a thing, too, as setting your teeth and carrying on, and saying: This is my

country, and I won't be bullied out of it even if they make things unpleasant for me. And since there are to be victims anyway, may it not be better that they should fall in their own country, stand their ground, dying for their right to live in the soil that is theirs, than die in flight, in exile ? The war for emancipation cannot be fought without casualties any more than any other war. Would English or American Jews suddenly cease to love England or America and to adhere to English or American ways because a Government had come in that ill-treated them ? If the Ku-Klux-Klan had succeeded in dominating America, would American Jews—all the four million of them—have poured en masse into Palestine, or the Atlantic ? And those of them who would go abroad, would the sights and sounds of their American homeland cease to stir their memories and their yearnings ?

Though one can understand the Jewish hostility to Hitler Germany (the German Jews, even the refugees, are not hostile ; they are downcast, grief-stricken, at most embittered). For if this is war against the Jews, what else can they do but fight back ? In the Great War, we were not to sheathe the sword until the military domination of Prussia was wholly and finally destroyed. There was to be no patched-up peace that would expose our children to a revival of the German menace. The killing of Germans was a divine service. " Germany's philosophy," said Lord Grey, then Foreign Minister, " is that a settled peace spells disintegration, degeneracy. We are fighting this idea." And Mr. G. K. Chesterton told us that " with the Germans their own natural superiority has become a first principle." We are in many respects back in the war years. Even

to the charge of tearing up treaties, the "scrap of paper." The German Constitution which guaranteed the equality of rights and duties of the Jewish citizens of Germany was such a scrap of paper.

But as for antisemitism, I am sure most Jews could give points to any antisemite about the faults of Jews, since they know them better than the antisemites do. We are always rubbed the wrong way most by those with whom we are in closest contact. I am sure a good many Tommies during the war felt more murderous towards their sergeants than they did to any German. Judged by the invective directed against the Jews, the Bible is the most antisemitic book there is. And if it comes to racial Jewishness, Moses did not hesitate to open the ground under Korah. I would not call it antisemitism if Germany suppressed all crooks, all degenerates, even all foes of the present regime, and all those among them who are Jews. I hate suppression, and I am not sure about the definitions, but it would not be confined to Jews as Jews. And as Burke showed, you cannot draw an indictment against a whole people. It you generalise from the individual, there is no crime of which the Jews cannot be made guilty. But there is also the obverse. Zangwill had something to say of the tendency to draw one's notion of an Englishman from Viscount Cecil, and of a Jew from Fagin, and forget Bill Sikes, or in real life, let us say Stinie Morrison and Charles Peace. "Facts point in all directions, like the thousands of twigs on a tree," says G. K. Chesterton. "It is only the life of the tree that has unity." It is a healthy symptom to have aversions. People turn up their nose at Niggers, Chinks, Froggies, Boches, Yanks, Wops and Dagoes, not only at Sheenies.



Scotch and Irish have come in for some hard thwacks, too. Jews don't like everybody, either. Only the aversion must not go the length of denying people their rights as human beings. Yet Zoological Jewishness is no better than Hitlerist Germanism. I have never, for instance, been able to understand why to be a good Jew, one must swallow Einstein whole. Relativity may be right or wrong, but I refuse to regard Relativity as part of the Jewish creed. Einstein is no doubt a great man, and Relativity may be true, but it does not make me less a Jew, if I, knowing nothing about the higher mathematics, fail to commit myself either way. As for Einstein's Jewish thought, he contends that "Judaism is not a creed: the Jewish God is simply a negation of superstition, an imaginary result of its elimination. It is also an attempt to base the moral law on fear, a regrettable and discreditable attempt." I do not understand Relativity, but I know that this is not Judaism. Is there a Jewish God other than any other God? What becomes of our monotheism? And "an imaginary result of the elimination of superstition!" "Judaism a regrettable and discreditable attempt to base the moral law on fear!" I shall not take my Jewish doctrine from Einstein, any more than I should from Spinoza, though both were born Jews. When the 250th anniversary of Spinoza's death was being commemorated in his native Holland in 1927, the Jewish communities of the country did not take part, pointing out that Spinoza had cut himself adrift from Judaism. "They honoured Spinoza as a philosopher and as a man, and as one of the greatest thinkers of the world, but not as a Jew." If we accented all doctrines formulated by great Jews

(by birth) we should all be Christians. And in the same way, not being a zoological Jew, I hold no brief for sharks, or sedition-mongers, or white slave traffickers who happen to have been born Jews, or even call themselves or are called by others Jews. That is not what Judaism came into the world for and has persisted for.

Nor because Jews suffer in Germany has the whole German question become solely a Jewish question. Not long before Hitler's Chancellorship, Dr. Kollenscher, one of the Zionist leaders of the Berlin Jewish Community, reminded us that "all questions in Germany cannot be judged from the purely Jewish point of view. The only things Jews can demand is that their rights as citizens should not be infringed, and their religious rights protected." It is because the rights of Jews as citizens are being infringed that we protest, and not only Jews protest. But everything else that is right in Germany does not thereby become wrong. I would rather believe Hitler able, sincere and sane, than believe the whole German people could follow a madman and a quack. If Germany can, the whole world may. No! I will not believe that any quack or any madman can lead a great nation by the nose, even when the world has driven it to despair. I will not believe that villainy and wrong-headedness can inspire any people for long. What was it Carlyle said of this sort of hypothesis about men's doings and history?

All isms by which man has ever for a length of time striven to walk in this world have had a truth in them, or men would not have taken them up. It seems to me a most mournful hypothesis, that of quackery giving birth

to any faith, even in savage men. We shall not see into the true heart of anything if we look merely at the quackeries of it. Why a false man cannot build a brick house! If he do not know and follow truly the properties of mortar, burnt clay and what else he works in, it is no house that he makes, but a rubbish heap; it will fall straightway.

Incidentally, a man, even if he is a Jew, is at the same time other things, too, with interests which affect his life as much. He may be a capitalist or a proletarian, an intellectual or a "sport," a mystic or a rationalist, a lawyer, a writer, a politician, an engineer, a tobacconist or a navvy, a Sanscrit scholar or an explorer, a Freemason, a painter, a musician, a mathematician, a chess-player or an Esperantist, a builder, a gardener, a footballer, a surgeon or an invalid, a Liberal, a Fascist, or a Communist, a Peer of the Realm or a dustman, a first-edition collector or a cinema-fan, as closely or more closely identified with these other interests as with those of his fellow-Jews. It is only the abnormal conditions that exist to-day that force one's Jewishness disproportionately into the foreground. You can't meet the onslaught of a tiger by pretending that he is not there.

It is not all Jews who look with apprehension to the rising menace to the Jews of Central and Eastern Europe. There are some who gloat over the prospect of Jewish troubles, not because they are evil men, but because they subscribe to the doctrine of "the worse the better," like the Socialists or Communists who look to the pressure of world misery to bring their liberating revolution. A prominent English Zionist said on the eve of Hitlerism:

In the future I believe we shall have great disturbances all over the world, and the Jew, whether he wants to or not, must recognise the call of his race and the fact that he must stand or fall on his own. I believe that we are on the threshold of a prosperous year for Zionism. In the disturbances of the day lies our hope of the future.

I asked at the time how this Zionist was going to provide for the millions of Jewish refugees whom his "disturbances of the day" would bring scuttling out of their native lands, battered and destitute, with Palestine unable to find room for a tithe of a tithe of them. He was a "moderate" Zionist. I would recall here what that "extremist" Zionist, Jabotinsky, has said: "Jews must be prepared to meet any catastrophes that arise. But I always pray—Please God, make no catastrophes. Rather, delay our salvation."

In 1903, when Dr. Herzl went to Petersburg, to intervene with the antisemitic Russian Government on behalf of the Russian Jews, Plehve, the Minister of the Interior, told him: "We do not want to lose all our Jews. We would gladly get rid of the feebler minds and the smaller possessions. But those who can assimilate we would like to keep." But also no country in the world can absorb population at such a rapid and instantaneous rate as some people think. It took fifty-three years for 2,335,559 Jews to emigrate to America, from 1881 till 1933, and not, of course, from Russia alone. It has been calculated that at the height of the immigration to the United States, during the peak years, the total of all immigration from all countries and of all nationalities, represented an annual two per cent increase of the population. That

is, it seems, the utmost that any country can usefully absorb. For while an insufficiently populated country is starving, it must not be overfed with population to bursting-point. There are clearly defined limits in both cases, determined by economic laws, as well as by common sense.

Not even the Inquisition brought about a wholesale exodus of the Jews from Spain. Dr. Cecil Roth has reminded us that "the traditional story of the providential establishment of the fleeing Marranos in Amsterdam, Hamburg, London, and a few other places, is misleading." The process was spread over many generations, and for the most part followed the abandonment of the Mediterranean trade routes in favour of the Atlantic, in the period when the great discoveries of Vasco da Gama and Christopher Columbus were bearing fruit.

It is not even necessary to believe that the decline of Spain came about as the result of the expulsion of the Jews. The Jews did not immediately troop out and begin to encompass the destruction of the land they had left. Too many Jewish apologists try to make it seem as if one were the inevitable consequence of the other. The Jews have not so much power. Mr. Joseph Kastein, for instance, in his book *Jews in Germany*, writes that the Holy Inquisition "led to the driving of the remainder of the still unbaptised Jews out of Spain. When this victory was obtained the material and spiritual downfall of the country began at an equally headlong speed." It is very dramatic, this immediate retribution. But it is not true. And when Bertrand Russell, in the first weeks of Nazi rule, wrote in a warning to Germany that "Spain ruined

itself in the sixteenth century by the expulsion of its Jews," it was pointed out to him that the Jews were expelled not in the sixteenth but in the fifteenth century, the edict of expulsion being dated March 31st, 1492, and that the great age of Spanish achievement came long after this event. The high-water mark of her material greatness was not reached till late in the sixteenth century, and the golden age of her literature and art came in the seventeenth century, to which the greatest writings of Cervantes, Lope de Vega, and Calderon, and the paintings of Velasquez, Murillo, and El Greco, belong.

Dr. Nathan Reich has similarly drawn attention to the fallacy in Sombart's thesis of the

simultaneity of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain and their resettlement in Antwerp and Holland, with the shifting of the economic centre from the Mediterranean and South German region to the north-west. In the first place [he points out] the simultaneity of the migration with this shifting of the economic centre of Europe is far from established. The foundations of North-western Europe's economic greatness antedates by many years the advent of the Jewish exiles from the Iberian Peninsula. Also Sombart's interpretation ignores the important fact that only a small minority of Jews made their way to Holland and North Germany, while the greater part fled to Turkey, North Africa, Eastern Europe, where their settlement was not followed by an outburst of capitalistic development.

Of course [he proceeds] it is undeniable that the Jews contributed greatly to make Holland the commercial centre of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Possessed of a vast store of financial experience from their Spanish days, they naturally made the most of their commercial capacities, and Sombart brings ample evidence to prove the great rôle they played in the economic life of the Netherlands.

"No doubt, bloody persecution was an immediate cause of the flight of thousands of Jewish refugees from Eastern Europe," writes Dr. Cecil Roth, who has just published *A Short History of the Jewish People*, which "is something more," as he explains, "than a record of persecution, suffering and scholarship."

More, perhaps, were influenced by the deliberate blocking of opportunity which was the considered policy of Czarist Russia. But it is absurd to assume that the Jews were not actuated also by the same human and economic causes which led to the simultaneous migration of hundreds of thousands of their compatriots. There may have been the menace of the sword behind, but there was the promise of a golden land in front.

In no single year [he adds] did the Jewish immigrants number more than 10 per cent of the total. The influx was composed of Italians, Greeks, Irish and a dozen other nationalities: in no case exposed at home to anything which could fairly be termed persecution. There were very large numbers even of Russians—of pogrom-makers, not of sufferers from them.

Dr. David Mowshowitch, writing of the migration movement in 1928, pointed out while in 1927 there had been 18,074 Jewish emigrants from Poland and the number in 1928 was 18,211, the number of non-Jewish Poles who had emigrated in these two years was 129,540 in 1927 and 168,369 in 1928. And the *Jewish Guardian*, which printed the article, commented in its editorial:

These facts make it clear that we are dealing with a wholly economic problem, and with what is very far from a wholly Jewish problem. Big sections of the population of vast countries are compelled by a necessity which they recognise to change their place of residence. Largely, but far from predominantly, those migrants are Jews. But it

is not their Judaism which drives them out, either as fact or cover. They are driven by internal causes. The war has acted like an earthquake in shifting settled landmarks. There is too much agriculture in some countries, too much manufacture in others; in some, too many hands without tools, in others, too many ploughs without hands.

Zangwill, in his work in the Jewish Territorial Organisation, never suggested the possibility of a wholesale Jewish exodus. "A problem," he pointed out, "exists only for those who feel it. The Jews who will and can remain in the Diaspora prove, ipso facto, that for them the situation is not intolerable." And further, "There is no human means by which fourteen or fifteen million Jews (about seventeen million now), scattered through all countries, can be agglomerated in a single territory."

The position is that there is a considerable pressure of surplus population in a number of European countries, which affects, among others, a great many Jews, who are suffering in Germany from political antisemitism, and in other countries from economic antisemitism. It is not exclusively a Jewish problem, not even in Germany, where political discrimination is applied also against other sections of the population. There are, at the same time, a number of large underpopulated countries, including the British Dominions of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and the South American States, like Argentina and Brazil and others, which are capable of absorbing a considerable increase of population, that would benefit them by helping to develop them more in keeping with their size and their potential importance in the world. Even in the United States of America after all the tremendous



development that has taken place, states like Texas and Iowa still have insignificant populations.

In the interests of the surplus populations of Europe, who are starving where they are, but if they had the opportunity could make good in new lands, as their forerunners there have done ; in the interests of those lands, whose resources are at present not being fully utilised, and which should not be condemned to remain backward and undeveloped ; in the interests of the world at large and of world-peace, which can be assured only if the pressure of surplus population is relaxed—measures must be taken to make possible a certain amount of shifting of human material from the over-populated to the under-populated parts of the world. “Must the indomitable millions lie cooped up in this western nook, choking one another as in a Blackhole of Calcutta,” Carlyle exclaimed, “while a whole fertile untenanted earth, desolate for want of the ploughshare, cries—Come and till me, come and reap me !”

Professor Brunheis, in his book, *Human Geography*, writes :

The distribution of human beings is an all-important geographical fact. The two Americas which finally, invaded by migrations of men from the Old World, show themselves so favourable to population in so many regions, were for a long time uninhabited districts. A hundred years ago they were devoid of men in comparison with other parts of the world. To-day human beings are localised and distributed on the earth in a manner that is far from being exclusively dependent on natural conditions.

Europe is over-full. And Asia is crammed with population. Japanese expansionist militarism is obviously dangerous but there is the need for more land

for its densely congested hard-working population behind it. And the same is true in Europe of Germany and Italy. There is a belief that Africa offers room for white settlers, but this seems to be mistaken. Those who know the African Continent point out that Africa possesses a native population which is increasing in number, and already finds the lands at its disposal insufficient, land-hunger being the chief cause of tribal unrest.

All the progress effected in Africa has been done by the brawn of the willing natives, and if they should ever combine in a policy of passive resistance, every European and Asiatic, too, would have to leave the country within a month.

In the main Africa is no place for colonisation by the white man. It is not like the Americas, North or South, nor Australia, nor New Zealand—countries of relatively healthy land inhabited at the outset by a sparse population living by hunting. Africa will support—indeed, it requires—a limited population of leaders of agricultural, mining and industrial enterprises, of merchants and engineers, administrators and technical experts, but the mass of the working population is and will remain African. Except by the elimination of the existing population, Africa promises no outlets for the relief of European over-population.

### CHAPTER III

#### “THE BROADER THE BASIS FOR ANY IMMIGRATION PROGRAMME . . . THE GREATER CHANCE FOR THE SUCCESS OF SUCH A VENTURE ”

AMERICA and Australia (and perhaps Siberia, in the Far East of Asia) are the only Continents that have the space and the means to support new-comers. Expert reports about conditions in the South American countries go to confirm the belief that these vast territories are now again economically able to admit new population with advantage to their own development. “Both financially and economically the country is to-day in far healthier circumstances; labour conditions continue to be satisfactory, and unemployment—never a problem of serious magnitude—is being steadily reduced.” That is the report of the Bank of London and South America on Argentina, presented to its last general meeting held in December, 1935. In Brazil, the report says,

On the whole there is a general feeling that internal conditions have shown some improvement, and this is demonstrated by the expansion of industrial and other undertakings in Sao Paulo and elsewhere. The production of raw cotton shows a gratifying increase during the vast

two years. Taking a broad view of the coffee situation during the past twelve months, there appears to have been a definite and consistent improvement in the industry. Shipments during the past few months have shown an encouraging increase. Uruguay's outlook for the next twelve months is rather brighter than in recent years. Prospects for the coming wool season and harvests are so far favourable, and a more intensive cultivation of sidelines—dairy-farming, fruit-growing and the like—affords an appreciable and ever-increasing addition to her main exports. Latterly there has been a welcome development of canned meat purchases by the United States. The agricultural harvests were sufficient to cover the country's needs and provide a small surplus for export. The general situation in Chile has shown a distinct improvement during the past year. Unemployment is no longer a problem, for the available labour is absorbed in building activities, public works and the mining and nitrate industries. National industry has been encouraged, and there are but few factories which are not working full time. The mining industry has been active on the whole. Coal has been mined in greater quantities and now figures as an export in a small way. Better prices compensated agriculturists for their harvests, which were somewhat less abundant than those of the previous year, and prospects for this year's crops are promising. Wool growers have disposed of their product satisfactorily, and the sheep farming companies have improved their position during the year. Colombia seems to be in danger of suffering from a world surplus of mild coffees as a result of competition from other countries favoured with suitable coffee growing soil and plant. But during the year large investments have been made in new mines and old gold workings. The mineral resources of the country—petroleum, platinum and gold—are important, and their further development, which is proceeding rapidly, will be of benefit to Colombia in providing exports of consequence other than coffee and so freeing her from too great reliance on a single product.

In Paraguay,

Immigration is fortunately expanding and is encouraged by the authorities. Numerous arrivals from the East of Europe—Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia—are settling there, and Japan has also sent many of her nationals to take up the virgin and fertile land which can be acquired at a very low figure in terms of foreign currency.

This is no place for discussing international trade policy, but it is of interest to note that the report of the Bank of London and South America draws attention to the fact that "restrictions on international trade, which have been so much in evidence during recent years, still continue, to the detriment of the countries in which we operate," though "on the other hand, in practically every case, the internal position of these countries shows some improvement, and efforts are evidently being made to overcome the obstacles."

Free trade is not a popular doctrine in these days, but there seems to be a growing feeling that the system of trade barriers and of national self-sufficiency is responsible for the breakdown of international trade and of international movement, and that, as Sir George Paish has said: "The world to-day is pursuing a policy that is bringing it into the greatest distress ever known, so great a distress that the present social order could not be maintained. Upon this the financial experts of the world are agreed." Sir Alfred Salter, speaking as Director of the Economic Section of the League of Nations, has explained

why new trade barriers began to grow up in the years immediately succeeding the war. For the four years of war conditions and blockades compelled countries which had previously imported articles from abroad to make

those articles at home. Home industries were never so effectively protected as they were by the submarine. When the blockades ended the effect was the same as it would have been in a high protectionist country that suddenly abolished the whole of its tariffs. No free trader, however extreme, would advocate a measure involving such unemployment, such dislocation, such general loss as an act like that would involve. It was, therefore, natural that the countries should proceed to mitigate what would otherwise have been the dislocation caused by suddenly throwing open to world competition industries that had grown up under the shelter of blockades, and should protect them by means of new trade barriers of one sort or another. Further, when the war finished, many countries were short of their most immediate necessities in the way of food and raw materials, and it was natural that they should impose one form or another of restriction on the export of such stores as they might have in their own territories. There were other reasons arising out of the war and war conditions which made it natural, intelligible, and for a time even right, that new tariffs and new trade barriers should be imposed. But however intelligible and however right at first, the continuance of such tariffs long after the causes for which they were originally imposed had disappeared resulted in the greatest possible danger and loss.

Sir Walter Layton has pointed out, however, "that a very large part of the population everywhere is definitely protectionist," and also that

if you swept away all the tariff walls of Europe quickly and at once, there would be a great disturbance and migration of industry. Certain industries would disappear from certain countries, and they would move to the particular places where they could most suitably be carried on. The nations of Europe are apparently not prepared to face that situation.

At the same time, as Mr. A. V. Alexander, M.P.,

a former Labour Minister, and the Parliamentary Secretary of the Co-operative Movement, an organisation of consumers in this country five million strong, has emphasised :

The problem before the world to-day is how to relate consumption to the increasing powers of production. It is because the world in all its economic and financial wisdom has not been able to persuade men to grapple with that question that it is literally true to say that thousands starve to-day who might not starve if there were a little more commonsense exhibited among the nations of the world. Those who work in the Labour Movement know that there is a very specious appeal being made to the organised workers. It is said that the lower conditions of labour in other countries set up such a severe competition that they must protect themselves. Yet what is the fact ? Taking even a new and potentially rich country like Australia, with tariffs of an incidence higher in many cases than that of the United States of America, the workers find themselves in relatively the same position as the workers in Central Europe. They are dealing with the serious problem of wages chasing prices. The Tariff Board of Australia has issued a Report in which it says that unless the workers of Australia can be persuaded not to continue asking for more wages as tariffs go up and as the cost of living goes up, thereby making a wider gap between the wage level of Australia and the wage levels of Europe than that which already exists, nothing but economic disaster faces Australia. I think that this puts the case in a nutshell.

It is not surprising to find a Free Trade writer emphasising that "tariffs are planned with the intention of making shipping less necessary, since imports are carried by ships," and that this accounts for the fact that shipbuilding and shipping have reached the lowest ebb within living memory. But here is a big banker, Mr. E. B. Orme, telling the shareholders of

Martin's Bank in Liverpool that the difficulties of our all-important industries of shipping and shipbuilding are due to the hampering of the exchange of goods. "It is obvious," he declared, "that the doctrine of self-sufficiency cannot be continued indefinitely." In the same way, Mr. Tuke, the Chairman of Barclays Bank, has emphasised to his general meeting that

it is the spirit of self-sufficiency which is making difficult the increase of international trade, upon which depends not only the raising of our own standard of living, but also that of other countries. I feel justified [he concluded] in believing that eventually a way will be found of removing the fears, which by leading to the adoption of policies of economic self-sufficiency retard international progress.

At the beginning of this year the big banks were holding their meetings, and at all of them the dangers of economic nationalism was emphasised. Mr. Beaumont Pease, the Chairman of Lloyds Bank, for instance, said that

the well-recognised obstacles to that greater measure of international trade which alone can effect a wholesale improvement, still loom largely in the path of progress. As long as the flow of goods from one country to another is impeded by the number of restrictions now in existence, no great or permanent alteration in present conditions seems possible.

Mr. Dewhurst, the Chairman of Williams Deacon's Bank said :

The difficulties and obstacles are obvious. Economic nationalism, currency restrictions, tariffs, quotas, etc., all play their part in hampering international trade, and must be overcome, or mitigated, before confidence, the main-spring of business, can be restored.



I see that Sir Harry McGowan, the chairman and managing director of Imperial Chemical Industries, addressing his general meeting on April 27, 1936, feared that "so far as one's vision can pierce the future, there seems little likelihood of any disappearance of this economic nationalism that is still persistent throughout the world."

But it is significant when a Conservative Professor of History like Professor Hearnshaw complains in a sober Conservative organ like the *Daily Telegraph* of "jacks-in-office who have gone a long way with their restrictions and regulations to damp down economic activity altogether." It sounds almost like Buckle, writing in the 'fifties of last century, of

those politicians who went blundering on in the track, believing that no commerce could flourish without their interference, troubling that commerce by repeated and harassing regulations, and taking it for granted that it was the duty of every government to benefit the trade of their own people by injuring the trade of others.

This is, I am afraid, a digression, but, I believe, a very necessary digression, that brings me back to the reference in the report of the Bank of London and South America to the "restrictions on international trade, which have been so much in evidence during recent years and still continue, to the detriment of the countries in which we operate."

And yet, "in practically every case, the internal position of these countries shows some improvement." Emphasis should also be placed on the very pregnant remark in the same report about "immigration in Paraguay fortunately expanding and encouraged by the authorities." It seems to indicate the beginning

of a more intelligent attitude to immigration in under-populated lands as the source of their development and prosperity.

It has also served to remind us of Mr. Alexander's authoritative warning as a Labour leader to the organised workers, particularly of "a new and potentially rich country like Australia," that the danger lies not in the bogey of "lower conditions of labour in other countries," but in "the serious problem of wages chasing prices," and his invocation of the Report of the Tariff Board of Australia that "unless the workers of Australia can be persuaded not to continue asking for more wages as tariffs go up, nothing but economic disaster faces Australia."

There are also other dangers facing Australia. A good deal has been written of the danger of Japan to Australia. There was not long ago a book published by Heinemann, called very bluntly, *Australia—White or Yellow?* According to this book

Australia must admit Asiatics to her tropical areas, and break all records with British settlement in the South. Otherwise, destruction by such a nation as Japan or Italy, whose population pressure gives it the right to act, as well as forces it to do so.

And a competent reviewer of the book makes the extremely pertinent comment that "Australia would certainly commit national suicide rather than accept this solution." But he urges Australia, "to prepare for and conduct a more rapid national growth." Mr. Ronald Walker, trying to see the Japanese side of the case, remarks:

They have doubled their population in little more than a generation. They have improved vastly their standard

of living, by the strenuous and efficient industrialisation of their island. They have exchanged with the world their products for the world's products, to the great gain of the world, and by such means it is possible for them to grow in wealth, power and individual prosperity. They are debarred from some of the emptiest parts of the world (Australia is uneasily aware of this truth) and their own islands are crammed to overflowing.

I would not presume to suggest to Australia what she should do to meet the dangers that all are agreed face her. But Ruskin's rule of conduct for the individual man seems to apply: "I believe, in brief, that he ought to know three things—First, where he is. Secondly, where he is going. Thirdly, what he had best do under those circumstances."

What best do under those circumstances? The first thing to do, it seems, would be to settle on an economic basis as many British people as possible; and next, to facilitate the settlement, in a way best conducive to the promotion of the national economy, of such people who are most likely to assimilate in the shortest time to the British character of the Dominion, and to fit in generally to the conditions which it is creating in order to enable it to move in the direction in which it has made up its mind it is going.

Mr. James G. MacDonald, the late High Commissioner for German Refugees, said in one of his reports that

the difficulties of settlement and emigration do not consist solely in finding countries to which the refugees can go. Small numbers are being assisted constantly in finding their way to countries in all parts of the world, and larger numbers have found their way during the year to countries overseas in North and South America, as well as to

Palestine. An even more formidable difficulty is that of finding the necessary funds for emigration. However, there is a consensus of opinion among those qualified to speak, that the necessary resources could be found if a detailed and specific emigration programme agreed to by certain countries of immigration could be worked out. In fact, in the case of Palestine, where such a programme of immigration is provided for, the money essential to carry it out has been found. I am confident that such emigrants, aided to establish themselves as they would be by specially created financial institutions, would not only not be a burden, but on the contrary would be assets of great value to their new homelands.

In the summer of 1935, Mr. MacDonald reported that he had spent four months in South and Central America with Dr. S. G. Inman, chosen because of his special knowledge and wide experience in Latin America for more than twenty years. They visited in that period sixteen countries—Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Salvador, Santo Domingo and Uruguay. "In all the sixteen countries Dr. Inman or I talked, sometimes with the highest Government officials—Presidents, Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Finance, Agriculture, Labour and Commerce, and other officials particularly concerned with immigration problems. We did not, however, limit ourselves to talk with statesmen or diplomats. In all the countries we met and worked closely with the leaders of the Jewish communities. We also conferred with the representatives of national and foreign business interests. From both groups we received much valuable data and many helpful suggestions. In Argentina and Brazil I called also upon the highest

ecclesiastics. My talks with these Catholic leaders strengthened the conviction, which I gained in other quarters, that the broader the basis for any immigration programme in Latin America, the greater chance for the success of such a venture.

In all Latin America the largest economic possibilities are in Argentina and Brazil. But it is precisely in those countries that the present obstacles to general immigration are most difficult. Both countries emphasise that they are open to-day only to agricultural immigration. Immigrants other than those trained for work on the soil, or willing to do agricultural labour, can be admitted only in exceptional cases. Moreover, in Brazil the recent constitutional provision fixing quotas for all immigration, limits to narrow proportions even the admission of agriculturists. None the less, both in Argentina and Brazil we found the governmental officials gladly willing to study with us for many hours the special problem of the refugees. In neither country, however, have definite results yet been achieved.

Elsewhere in South and Central America the immigration restrictions are much less severe; indeed, in most of the countries there are no restrictions which could not be waived in favour of the refugees. One of the most notable examples of this liberal policy is the action of Colombia. On May 6th, through a Presidential decree, it was announced that the Consul General of the Republic in Paris had been authorised to grant visas to "individuals of good antecedents (buenos antecedentes) who have resources sufficient to live during the first months of residence and who intend to carry on useful activities in Colombia," even if such individuals "find it impossible to obtain passports from their countries of origin." Obviously the opportunities for work are fewer in the West Coast countries, or in those of Central America. However, considerable numbers of individuals could doubtless find employment, and there are also possibilities of group settlements in several of the countries.

Yet, by the end of the same year (1935) Mr. MacDonald, in his letter of resignation, complained that "in the present economic conditions of the world, even . . . States overseas have only a limited power of absorption of refugees. Pity and reason alike must inspire the hope that intercession will meet with response." There is a Jewish story which tells of a man overtaken at night by a terrible storm, who knocked at the door of a house and asked to be allowed to shelter there. The owner of the house opened the door a little, and through the aperture kept saying, "Poor man, what a pity! what a pity!" "Let me in, please," pleaded the other. "I'm getting drenched." "But if I let you in," came the answer, "there will no longer be any reason to pity you." But there is also a saying that "God sometimes shuts one door in order to open others wide."

I have quoted Mr. Alexander, a prominent figure in the British Labour movement, and the leader of the Co-operative movement in this country, a former Cabinet Minister, warning the workers of "even a new and potentially rich country like Australia" against "a very specious appeal being made to the organised workers" that they must protect themselves against lower conditions of labour, and declaring that "it is literally true to say that thousands starve to-day who might not starve if there were a little common-sense exhibited among the nations of the world." The Labour movements everywhere raise their voices against oppression and injustice and proclaim the rights of humanity and liberty. Yet in most countries where the workers have attained a high standard of living and are a powerful political factor, in the United

States, in Canada and Australia, the organised Labour movements are the most unwilling to help the victims of oppression in the only practical way. The Trade Union and Labour movements of these countries have never denied the accusation that they are the most stubborn opponents of a more liberal immigration policy, even though it should be that of staunch Trade Union and conscious Labour elements, crushed in their native lands, and comrades in their own battle for a better humanity. Mr. A. Patkin, of Melbourne, writing in the last issue of the *Freie Shriften*, a Yiddish magazine of Labour and Socialist Thought, edited by Dr. I. N. Steinberg, a well-known personality in the Movement, declares that

the decision lies only with the Trade Unions, and without their consent it is useless even to think of any immigration plans. To them, emigration is nothing more than a palliative for overcrowding and unemployment in Europe. The only way is to improve the standard of living in the old countries. This is, indeed, the attitude of the Australian working classes in the matter of immigration. It is also the dominant view of the Australian people. I cannot imagine any non-Labour Government, even with a majority in Parliament, daring to introduce any far-reaching immigration plans contrary to the wish of the Labour Opposition. In 1924, the Australian Labour Party Conference adopted a resolution protesting against any attempt to open Australia to mass immigration. "We are convinced," it said, "that the immigration policy of the present Capitalist Government must result in flooding the Australian labour market with cheap labour which will force down the level of living of the Australian worker." In 1927, the Australian Trades Union Congress decided that "mass immigration assists the Capitalist class."

Meanwhile, the overcrowded and unemployed in

Europe must starve and be crushed by the madness that is engendered of despair, and be mocked by the exhortation, "improve the standard of living in your countries." Mr. Patkin recalls that Mr. Scullin, the Leader of the Parliamentary Labour Party, declared in Parliament in 1926 that "in the next two or three generations we shall have a population of a hundred million." But when he became Prime Minister in 1930, he quashed all previous immigration schemes.

Can this dog-in-the-manger policy last for ever? Can a country that has room for tens of millions of people bar itself against everybody, and refuse to allow anyone to come in? Pressure must come, both from outside and from within—and the first signs of it are already here. People are beginning to feel uneasy here about the abnormally slow increase of population. There is practically no increase by immigration, and the birth-rate is falling. The highly-paid workers have learnt to practise birth-control. The process of urbanisation is proceeding rapidly. The mechanisation of farming and mining and the exaggerated protectionist policy in favour of town industry is leading to the rapid growth of the cities. The feeling of uneasiness that exists is not prompted by anything like a bad conscience because of the masses of unemployed in England or Europe who are denied opportunities here. Europe is far away. There is growing anxiety because of Japan. At present she is occupied with China and Soviet Russia, but sooner or later she will thrust towards the empty Continent under her nose. Nobody here doubts this. It is open talk now. The population is being taught to prepare for such a military threat from the side of Japan. The logical consequence is that Australia must have a much larger population. In other words, Australia must admit a much larger stream of European immigration.

In a later article (March 1936) in the *Australian Jewish Herald*, Mr. Patkin writes :



Australia's answers to the immigration question have never been convincing. They are pretexts, which often contradict each other. If they were all collected and carefully considered they would be seen to be based on the simple selfishness of the "closed shop." And the Labour Parties are in this respect the most selfish and short-sighted.

Yet under the surface, there is much uneasiness [he continues] and people talk quietly among themselves of what may happen if some strong Power comes one day knocking at the closed door of this empty Continent, and demands that it should open, and the choice of the new immigrants may no longer be under the control of what to-day is Australia. The old feeling that Australia is safely removed from this danger, that it is thousands of miles away from the centre of disturbance, has gone. And there is a growing realisation, though it is not being openly expressed yet, that something must be done. We are, I think, on the threshold of a new turn in Australian immigration policy.

When Sir Charles Dilke was in Australia in 1866, he already noted the Trade Union opposition to immigration.

Manifestoes against the ordinary European immigration have repeatedly been published in Sydney by the Council of the Associated Trades. The Sydney operatives have always taken a leading part in opposition to immigration, from the time when they founded the Anti-Transportation Committee up to the present day. In 1847, a natural and proper wish to prevent the artificial depression of wages was at the bottom of the anti-transportation movement, although the arguments made use of in the petition to the Queen were of the most general character; and Sydney mechanics, many of them free immigrants themselves, say that there is no difference of principle between the introduction of free or assisted immigrants and that of convicts. If we look merely to the temporary results of the policy of the Australian artisans, we shall find it hard to deny that their acts are calculated momentarily to increase their

material prosperity; so far they may be selfish, but they are not blind. Admitting that wages depend on the ratio of capital to population, the Australians assert that, with them, population increases faster than capital, and that hindering immigration will restore the balance. Prudential checks on population are useless, they say, in face of Irish immigration. At the same time, it is clear that, from the discouragement of immigration and limitation to eight hours of the daily toil, there results an exceptional scarcity of labour, which cramps the development of the country, and causes a depression in trade which must soon diminish the wage-fund and re-act upon the working men. It is unfortunately the fact, that colonial artisans do not sufficiently bear in mind the distinction between real and nominal wages, but are easily caught by the show of an extra few shillings a week, even though the purchasing power of each shilling be diminished by the change. When looked into, "higher wages" often mean that the labourer, instead of starving upon ten shillings a week, is to starve upon twenty. As regards the future, contrasted with the temporary condition of the Australian labourer, there is no disguising the fact that mere exclusion of immigration will not in the long run avail him.

There was not always the "selfish discouragement of immigration." Sir Charles Dilke remarks that "the German element is strong in South Australia." How they came there is explained by Mr. George Sutherland in his book *The South Australian Company* :

From Prussian prisons many pathetic appeals for aid in their distress were being made by the persecuted pastors of the old Lutheran Church to British philanthropists at the time of the formation of the South Australian Company. It is curious to reflect that from this circumstance arises the similarity in the names to be found on the map of South Australia at the present day to those of certain provinces of Germany. The Germans were soon recognised as being among the most industrious and trustworthy of

the colonists. And indeed it was to be fairly expected that they would prove to be such, seeing that they had proved their attachment to what they regarded as truth and their ineradicable love of religious liberty by going into voluntary exile among people whose language and manners were entirely strange to them.

“To the Jews,” too, “Australia has in more senses than one been a land of sunshine,” says the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, in an article written by Rabbi Freedman, of Perth, in Western Australia, himself a distinguished Australian, who not long ago represented his country at the League of Nations.

Nurtured and reared on British traditions, Australia [he continues] has inherited the national characteristics of the mother-country. The spirit of democracy, so strong in Australia, has always manifested itself as a unified current that absorbs in itself all the varied elements of race and religion. Religious freedom accordingly has always been granted in full measure as soon as the colonies received legislative independence. Amid such conditions it was only natural that the Jews who settled there should find a cordial welcome and a hospitable home. Australia offered its great undeveloped resources to all who were willing to develop them. Many Jews embraced the opportunity and prospered. They have appreciably assisted in the development of the country, and many of them have gained distinction. Industry has been largely developed by them, and in the raising of sheep and cattle they have been particularly prominent, and in the government of the colonies they have had an honourable share. Jews have been mayors of nearly all the capital cities of Australia.

Sir Julius Vogel, who became Prime Minister of New Zealand, began his career as a boy of seventeen by emigrating to Australia. Vabian L. Solomon, who became Prime Minister of South Australia, was one

of the pioneers of the Northern Territory. The appointment of Chief Justice was held by Sir Julian Salomons and (since Rabbi Freedman wrote this) by Sir Isaac Isaacs, now the retiring Governor-General of Australia. When Rabbi Freedman wrote in the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, General Sir John Monash had not yet created his great Australian legend, and he is not mentioned in the survey. (Dr. Roback has shown me a letter to him from Sir John Monash, containing the noteworthy information that he was a nephew of the great Jewish historian, Graetz. And, indeed, the biographers of Graetz record that he married in 1850 Marie Monasch, of Krotoschin, in Moravia. Her brother's son, it seems, the son of a Moravian Jewish immigrant, given the chance, became the leader of the Australian army, and one of the greatest British generals of the war, a great Australian.) But there are two great Jews who are Australians, both born at Sydney, whom Rabbi Freedman was already able to include. One is Joseph Jacobs, the pioneer in Anglo-Jewish research, a founder and President of the Jewish Historical Society of England, scholar, critic, historian, statistician, folklorist, novelist, essayist. "He was a great Jew, but also—and perhaps the two are really one—a great humanist," Zangwill said of him. The other is Professor Samuel Alexander, the famous philosopher, and member of the Order of Merit, the only Jew, I think, who has ever held this great distinction. At the age of seventy-seven he is still happily with us, though the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, by a curious slip, records him as having died on November 8th, 1909. The foremost among the Jews who have figured as pioneers in Australia, Rabbi Freedman

continues, is Jacob Montefiore, a cousin of Sir Moses Montefiore.

South Australian history records him as one of the founders of the colony; and he was selected by the British Government to act on the first Board of Commissioners appointed in 1835 to conduct its affairs. His portrait hangs in its National Gallery and his memory is perpetuated by Montefiore Hill, one of the leading thoroughfares of Adelaide. His activity was not confined to South Australia. With his brother Joseph he gave an impetus to and left his impress upon the progress of New South Wales. He owned one of the largest sheep runs in the colony, and founded and for many years acted as director of the Bank of Australasia. The close connection of the brothers with the colony is further evidenced by the township of Montefiore, which stands at the junction of the Bell and Macquarie rivers in the Wellington valley. Joseph Montefiore was the first President of the first Jewish congregation formed in Sydney in 1832.

The two brothers, we find elsewhere, "founded the township of Montefiore, and contributed actively to the establishment there of places of worship for all denominations." Another Montefiore, Jacob Isaac Levi Montefiore, born in Barbados in 1819, emigrated to Australia at the age of eighteen, "and became one of the leading merchants of Sydney and took an active part in the development of the City." He was President of the Chamber of Commerce and a member of the first Legislative Council of New South Wales. The Montefiore connection with Australia persisted, for only a few years ago, Cyril Sebag-Montefiore died in Australia. Rabbi Freedman also records that M. V. Lazarus of Bendigo, known as Bendigo Lazarus, did much to open up new parts in the back country of Victoria; that the coal industry of Victoria received

a great impetus from the persistent advocacy of the Hon. Nathaniel Levi, that the cultivation of beetroot for the production of sugar and spirits likewise owes its existence as an industry to his ceaseless efforts ; and that in Western Australia the townships of Karridale and Boyanup owe their existence to the enterprise of M. C. Davies, a large lumber merchant. A Jew, Barnett Levy, who built the Theatre Royal in Sydney in 1833, was " the pioneer of the theatre in Australia."

" Australia has in more senses than one been a land of sunshine to the Jews." Before the war, there was a Jewish Agricultural Settlement established in Shepparton, a hundred miles from Melbourne. A fund was constituted by members of the Melbourne Jewish Community in 1913 with the object of " settling Jewish persons desirous of carrying on the occupations of farmers, graziers, orchardists and other like occupations in lands in the Commonwealth of Australia, and for the purpose generally of educating and assisting Jewish farmers in carrying on their operations and for the purpose of educating children as farmers." With the funds at its disposal, the Fund settled eight Jewish families on Government irrigation blocks at Shepparton, Victoria. Each settler secured a block of some forty or fifty acres, and the Government built suitable dwellings and made other necessary improvements. The Agricultural Settlement Fund made advances for the purpose of carrying on the farm and for the living of the settlers. On advice from the Government, peaches, apricots, pears and other fruit trees were planted, the opinion being that orcharding offered the best chance of success. From its original forty acres, the holdings increased to two hundred and fifty

acres, the land being worth anything up to £100 per acre. A report I saw a few years ago said that most of the settlers still speak Yiddish, but their children are English-speaking. At one farm a case-making factory has been established, where fruit cases are made for the Settlement. Some of the farmers are represented on the Shepparton Canneries, one of the largest fruit canneries in Australia. A small synagogue is attached to the Settlement and there is a shochet and a Hebrew teacher. In 1927, another Jewish Agricultural Settlement was started at Berwick, twenty-seven miles from Melbourne, on the main Sydney-Melbourne railway, and also owes its existence to the activities of the Australian Jewish Land Settlement Trust.

It was started with eighteen families, and in six months the Settlement was self-supporting. A British Economic Mission which was visiting Australia saw Berwick and had it photographed as one of the show-places of the State.

In this way, or in any other way best suited to the possibilities and the needs, Jewish immigrants could be found who would prove themselves adaptable and capable settlers in this "land of sunshine to the Jews," and would contribute fully to the life and prosperity of the Dominion.

## CHAPTER IV

### WHERE DOES THE JEW BELONG ?

It is perhaps old-fashioned to quote Macaulay's p for Jewish emancipation in these days of race antisemitism and of Zionism (which was conceived as answer to antisemitism—"If we only begin to carry out the plan, antisemitism would stop everywhere at once" is what Herzl, the founder of the Zion Organisation said). But I, for one, have not accepted the thesis that because of what has happened in Germany and the economic distress in other countries Jewish emancipation has failed. And the fact that we must reckon with Hitlerism and fight it, does not to my mind, mean that we must surrender to Hitler's philosophy. On the contrary, we must fight it.

Government [said Macaulay] exists for the purpose of keeping the peace, for the purpose of compelling us to settle our disputes by arbitration instead of settling them by blows, for the purpose of compelling us to supply our wants by industry instead of supplying them by rapine. If there is any class of people who are not interested, who do not think themselves interested, in the security of property and the maintenance of order, that class ought to have no share of the powers which exist for the purpose of securing property and maintaining order. But why should a man be less fit to exercise those powers because he wears a beard, because he does not eat ham, because



goes to the Synagogue on Saturdays instead of going to the Church on Sundays, we cannot conceive. The points of difference between Christianity and Judaism have very much to do with a man's fitness to be a bishop or a rabbi. But they have no more to do with his fitness to be a magistrate, a legislator or a minister of finance than with his fitness to be a cobbler. On nine hundred and ninety-nine questions out of a thousand, on all questions of police, of finance, of civil and criminal law, of foreign policy, the Jew, as a Jew, has no interest hostile to that of the Christian. The feeling of patriotism, when society is in a healthful state, springs up by a natural and inevitable association, in the minds of citizens who know that they owe all their comforts and pleasures to the bond which unites them in one community.

"We reject absolutely this conception put forward by the German delegate with regard to the racial homogeneity of political units and States," Mr. Ormsby-Gore, a member of the British Government has declared in a speech delivered on behalf of the Government at Geneva.

This Aryan doctrine and the doctrine of homogeneity quite frankly could not apply to the British Empire. Disraeli was three times Prime Minister of England, and nationally a devoted and patriotic Englishman. At the same time he was a Jew, and he belonged to a racial minority which deserves the same treatment as all other minorities. What is that treatment? Above all, equal rights of citizenship and fair treatment as loyal citizens of the nation to which they have been attached. Wherever the Jews had been well and liberally treated they have been the most loyal and helpful members of the nations.

"Witness," as Zangwill wrote, "the rhapsodies of Sir John Monash over Australia, whose soldiers he led to unbroken victory. Here you have a real conquering Jew, but his legend will be Australian."

I had a friend, Isaac Rosenberg, the poet, who was killed in the war. Most of the newer anthologies include his work. He was a Whitechapel Jew, born of immigrant parents, but in his poem, *Break of Day in the Trenches*, he tells the rat that leaps to his hand—"Now you have touched this English hand." And his writing belongs to English poetry.

Dr. Scott Lidgett, President of the United Methodist Church, has warned us that the racial and religious discrimination now enforced in Germany

strikes a deadly blow against all those principles of civil and religious freedom for which we are called to take our historic stand. If you were to extend the principles which are actuating the German Government and people at the present day you would reduce the civilisations of the world to chaos, and bring an end to all those great influences by which we have trusted that we should lead the whole world in the principles and practice of freedom and of order.

It is not only a Jewish question. Lord Cecil has said that what has happened in Germany is a challenge to Christian civilisation.

We are threatened [writes Charles Edward Russell] with an inundation of revived primitive instincts which threaten everything that has been gained for the sanctity of human dignity and human rights. If a minority can be persecuted in Germany because of religious belief, there is no security for minorities anywhere. It is not the foundations of Jewry that are menaced, but the world-wide foundations of a structure reared through generations of sacrifice and conflict. Such an issue should bring us into one front, Jew and Gentile together, one body of invincible opposition. It should teach us all the immanent demand for complete solidarity among all to whom justice, liberty, equality, decency are not empty words, but the most precious things of life.

A close associate of Dr. Herzl's, his first lieutenant, secretary and biographer, Mr. Jacob de Haas, has reminded us that it was the drum-beats in France which accompanied the degradation of Dreyfus that aroused in Herzl racial self-consciousness. Herzl himself admitted it: "What made me a Zionist was the Dreyfus affair," he wrote.

Antisemitism alone had made Herzl race-conscious [says Zangwill], and he defined himself as "a Jew by the grace of Stoecker" (the Hitler of the time). He had drawn from the Dreyfus case—which was the inspiration of his movement—the conclusion that a settled and dignified life for the Jew would never be possible in Christendom. I, on the contrary, had drawn from it the conclusion that Zola was essentially a Jew, and that in the organisation of such lovers of justice throughout the world and in co-operation with them lay the true path of Israel.

It is true that Max Brod complains that it has become a facile banality to accuse Zionism of setting out to do the same thing as antisemitism, both wanting to clear out the Jews. No, the aim of Zionism [he says] is, among other things, to concentrate the Jewish people, or a large part of it, in a closed, independent, powerful and inwardly healthy settlement, so that the hysterical way in which the form and value of our race is now being vilified, to the shame of all mankind, should automatically stop.

But Dr. S. Bernstein, the editor of an official Zionist periodical, *Dos Yiddishe Folk*, has written in the Herzl Memorial Volume: "Herzl has frequently been criticised because he bases his idea chiefly on anti-semitism. Many Zionists regard this as the weakest point of his ideology. Actually, however, it is a very strong point."

It was clear to Herzl [de Haas writes] that both Russia and Roumania were determined to be rid of their Jews, and that the Jews of Germany, Galicia and Austria should rejoice if they were offered an opportunity to leave those countries. Herzl therefore planned a reconcentration of Jews under entirely new conditions. What he envisaged was a self-governing community—a State on the order of Ireland to-day. This plan demanded speedy mass migration, to be rendered possible by the establishment of a sound economic basis in the land of settlement, which, incidentally, happened to be Palestine. Incidentally, because, while Herzl acknowledged and appealed to sentimental Jewish interest in Palestine, he was far less concerned with the rebuilding of Zion than with the successful permanent resettlement of the Jews under conditions which would afford them real freedom, equality and liberty. ("What mainly interested Herzl was the Jewish State," writes Mr. Leonard Stein. "What mainly interested those who now called upon him to lead them was Palestine.") He derided all attempts to deal with the Jewish question by philanthropic methods. All through his Zionist career he held to the tenet that philanthropy could not in any one year settle more Jews in Palestine than lived in one street in Warsaw, or Vienna. He approached every millionaire in turn with this clear statement: "I want no charity, but capital for productive investment."

It will scarcely need much effort to give a fillip to the movement. The antisemites will attend to it for us [Herzl wrote]. They need only do as much as till now, and the desire to emigrate will be aroused where it does not exist, and will be intensified where it already exists.

But Zangwill refused to accept antisemitism as an ally.

They could only accept help [he wrote] if its motive was pro-Jewish, not anti-Jewish, justice and not Jew-hate. Palestine could only receive and support the Jews in small instalments and as the majority of the thirteen (now

estimated at nearly seventeen) millions must long inhabit their present homes, an offer of Palestine, coupled with an aspiration, or worse, a policy for the clearance of other countries of Jews, would be a trap from which I should do my best to dissuade my fellow-Jews. No bait of Palestine will lessen the insistence of our demand for equal rights in Russia, Roumania, or wherever antisemitism drags down civilisation.

“Wherever antisemitism drags down civilisation.” We are back again to the “one front, Jew and Gentile together,” because “it is not the foundations of Jewry that are menaced, but the world-wide foundations of a structure reared through generations of sacrifice and conflict.” “The principles which are actuating the German Government and people would reduce the civilisations of the world to chaos.”

The Jews dare not surrender to Hitlerist philosophy, because the fight is not only theirs. It is the fight of civilisation, of the principles of civic and religious freedom. It is the fight even of Germany herself for her future. My friend Vernon Bartlett recently told us that it was a mistake to think

that the same Germans people had known and liked before Hitler became Chancellor have undergone some chemical change through the mere process of putting on brown shirts, and that their hearts and minds no longer work in the same way as before the Nazi revolution.

Mr. Lloyd George reminded us in the same way during the war that

we are not fighting the German people. The German people are under the heel of the Prussian military caste. It will be a day of rejoicing for the German peasant, artisan and trader when that caste is broken

Bagehot has drawn attention to "the necessity which rules all but the strongest men to imitate what is before their eyes, and to be what they are expected to be." But there comes the inevitable reaction. Anatole France expressed the idea when he wrote: "The Republic has created no Republicans. It is absolute government that makes Republicans." Auernheimer remarks that "there is a dominating law of life that forces succeeding generations, children and parents, into typical contrast to each other." Milton's father was the son of a zealous Papist, who disinherited him. Mr. James Maxton recently stood up in the House of Commons and confessed that he had been brought up very carefully, with a good Church education, as a sound Conservative patriot, who had belonged to the Cadets—and "look at me now," he exclaimed. It may not be out of place here to recall how, according to Anatole France, the anti-Jewish outburst in France collapsed: "A day came when the Trublions burst asunder, for they were full of wind."

I have never been one to apologise for my Judaism. I can say, as Sir Philip Hartog once said:

I am not a Jew only because I was born a Jew, without self-questioning of any kind, but because after much self-questioning, I find in Judaism the creed and the practice which seem to me to answer the social, emotional and purely religious needs of human nature more satisfactorily, more fully, with less contradictions than any other, and because I can honestly say that when all that process of questioning is done, I believe.

And because that is so, I refuse to accept the Hitlerist blood theory that would make me a Jew only because I was born one and would thrust Judaism on people

who want to have nothing to do with it. I have frequently expressed my doubts about whether the Jews of to-day are really directly descended from the Hebrews who lived in Palestine. It may be that they are. Though even if they should be, more than two thousand years of life on European soil, even if in all this time there was no admixture (which is hardly likely), cannot have left them unaffected. Mr. Jabotinsky relates that when he broached to Dr. Nordau during the war his plan to raise a Jewish army and to propose to Britain that she should use it against the Turks on the Palestine front, Nordau reminded him that Jews have an idea that the Moslems are kin to the Jews, "Uncle Ishmael." "That is only a legend," Jabotinsky replied. "Ishmael is not our uncle. We, thank God, belong to Europe, and for two thousand years have helped to create the culture of the West. We have nothing to do with the East." Some Zionists dream of Jews returning to the East, their original home. Jabotinsky looks to the Jews extending the borders of Europe as far as and beyond the Jordan. The *Jewish Encyclopædia* says that "The question whether the Jews of to-day are in the main descended from the Jews of Bible times and from them alone, is still undecided," and suggests that their uniformity of type may be due "either to unity of race or to similarity of environment, the fact that they live almost exclusively in towns, in part to medieval persecution and in part to the needs of public worship." I should say also the observance over a period of many generations of very detailed rules of conduct, of hygiene, of food (what foods may be eaten and what foods must not

be eaten, and to some extent their methods of preparation), which form part of the Jewish religious code. Buckle taught us what a great part food plays in influencing races.

Climate, food and soil have originated the most important consequences in regard to the general organisation of society, and from them there have followed many of those large and conspicuous differences between nations, which are often ascribed to some fundamental differences in the various races into which mankind is divided.

I have spoken in another place of the growing feeling among Jews who study the question that specific Jewish life was based on the observance of Jewish religion, that what seem to be national characteristics proceed from the organisation of religious and communal life,

and how easy it is for the one to develop into the other is shown by what happened to the Pilgrim Fathers, who went out to serve God in their own way, and in organising their religious and communal life, developed the New England States. But the impulse was religious.

After all, the Hebrew State in Palestine was built up in order to worship Jehovah. Abraham did not leave his father's house because he objected to his race, but because he refused to worship idols. When it came to marrying his son, he sent for his niece Rebecca. Moses was "the servant of God." And Jeroboam ben Nebat was no doubt a good Palestinian nationalist, but "he made Israel sin," and he was cut off.

Because some Jews have ceased to believe in Judaism, Judaism has not ceased to be the factor that determines the Jew. Even those ex-Jews are influenced by the results of their Jewish upbringing. And



those who have had none are not Jews, whatever the race theorists, Jewish or antisemitic, may say. That many Jews may be lax in the observance of their religion may be. So are many Christians, Moslems, Hindus. Macaulay reminded his readers that

the Church of Rome commands her followers to fast often, to be charitable to the poor, to take no interest for money, to fight no duels, to see no plays. Do they obey these injunctions? [he asked]. Many of these people do not care enough for their religion to go without beef on a Friday for it.

“Traditional Rabbinic Judaism is a comprehensive religion in the sense that it has given shape and colour to every part of life. Nothing has been too trivial to escape religious regulation or restriction, forming the Jews into a separate community,” Dr. Weinreich, the Research Director of the Jewish Scientific Institute at Vilna (a secular institution), has declared. Dr. Schechter, the Jewish theologian, has laid it down that “Judaism, the Jewish religion, permeates the whole of your life. It demands control over all your actions, and interferes even with your menu. Judaism is absolutely incompatible with the abandonment of the Torah.” (The Torah is the Jewish religious law.) Schechter was a Jewish theologian. But Dr. Herzl, the Zionist leader, was a self-confessed atheist, and he said, “The Return to Judaism must precede the Return to Zion.” And “our racial community is peculiar, unique. We recognise ourselves actually only as bound together by the faith of our fathers.” Though

everyone will be as free and unrestricted in his belief or disbelief as in his nationality. And if it should happen

that people who have other faiths and other nationality should live among us, we shall assure them respectful protection and equality of rights. We have learnt tolerance in Europe.

And Zangwill, who was no theologian, declared :

So long as the Diaspora believes in Judaism, it has no need of a spiritual centre. The Torah is its spiritual centre. To replace the religion which has kept the Diaspora alive nearly two thousand years, and which is a solid reality coming home to the Jew at every hour of the day, by an absentee nationalism is a conception which could occur only to visionaries. A "spiritual centre" in Zion may suffice to hold within its ghostly radius the first generation of absentee Zionists minus Judaism ; such a phantasm will not avail to keep their children Jewish.

And also : " Race unaided has no power of permanence. It is beyond question that at the best, the Jewish race must long look for its foothold to religion." A younger, more modern Jewish writer, Waldo Frank, declares :

If the synagogue permanently fails, the Jewish race is doomed. By synagogue I mean a focus for divine service by the Jews. It is shameful for a man to identify himself with an Idea or spiritual form simply because he was born into a word-association with it. We can't help being born brown-eyed or American or French. But to be a Methodist or a Republican or an Anarchist because I was born one is shameful. To be a Jew merely because I was born one is equally shameful, because the term Jew, with its ideal and spiritual essence extracted becomes a valueless expression.

Some years ago, I was present at the International Conference of Liberal Jews held in London, and I heard an American Rabbi, Dr. Samuel Schulman, say in his address : " I will not worry about the

Jewish blood. I worry about the Jewish religion. We are Jews in religion, and race is no obstacle to anyone accepting our religion and becoming a member of the House of Israel." Dr. Schulman is not a Zionist. But at the same Conference his point was expressly taken up by the Rev. M. L. Perlzweig, who is a prominent official Zionist, and who said: "The non-Jew, the Gentile, who is admitted into Judaism, becomes not only an adherent of a 'Church,' but he becomes a Son of Abraham." Rabbi Dr. David Philipson, a famous American Rabbi, has declared:

I have a distinct feeling of religious brotherhood but no nationalistic fellowship with Jews of other lands whether now they dwell in Palestine or in Egypt, in Brazil or in Italy. For me the Jewish world bond is religious and not national or racial.

Another American Rabbi, Dr. Jacob Kohn, has been even more explicit:

Consider some great Jews of non-Jewish blood -- Aquilla, the Greek, or the King of the Chazars. They were Jews because they accepted the Jewish religion. A man may have lived all his life on the soil of Palestine, the Hebrew language and literature might be the only one with which he were conversant, he might become the citizen of a Palestinian State, Jewish or non-Jewish, yet not for one instant would Jewish law regard him other than Gentile. On the other hand, imagine a person whose ancestors had never set foot on the soil of Palestine, who himself had never been to Palestine, had never heard a Hebrew word, and yet his acceptance of the commandments of the Jewish religious law, his conversion to Judaism, would immediately qualify him for membership within the Jewish people, and every barrier would be removed. There are no cultural requirements necessary for inclusion in the Jewish people save one—the religious requirement, and that

necessity neither citizenship in a Palestinian State nor saturation in Hebraism can obviate. Intermarriage was never forbidden on purely racial and national grounds, but always on religious grounds.

Maimonides himself declared :

Everyone who becomes a convert until the end of all generations, and everyone who acknowledges the Unity of God as it is written in the Torah, is a disciple of our father Abraham and a member of his household. Consequently, Abraham is the father of his seed, the pure ones who walk in his ways, and the father of his disciples. For that reason you (the convert) have the right to say, "Our God and God of our fathers," because the patriarch Abraham is your father. Let not your descent be lightly esteemed in your eyes. If we trace our genealogical tree to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, you may trace yours to the Creator of the Universe.

Dr. Cecil Roth writes : "Racial antisemitism depends almost for its very existence upon the assumption that the Jews are a pure race, entirely distinct from European peoples." And he proceeds to illustrate at some length "the infiltration of Gentile blood among the Jews," and he points out that "once a person had embraced Judaism, he was treated in every respect as a born Jew. The Rabbis were at pains to point out (as no Talmudic student could forget) how the grandson of a proselyte might become High Priest." He shows how a "mixed multitude" is recorded to have gone forth with the Hebrews from Egypt, how intermarriage with the survivors of the conquered tribes of Palestine was inevitable, how the Maccabean warrior-kings assimilated by force the border tribes whom they subdued, how Idumaeans played a decisive rôle in Jewish history at the period of the last revolt.

In a later period, when the Jewish Diaspora had already reached Europe, the process continued. The Roman Empire was filled with proselytes, attracted by the glories of Hebrew monotheism. At one period there appeared to be the possibility that Judaism was to sweep the civilised world, in just the same fashion as Christianity was ultimately to do ; and contemporary Latin writers professed to be alarmed at the prospect. Of the two hundred Tannaim, or Rabbis, of the century before and after the destruction of Jerusalem, seven are recorded as being of Gentile extraction ; of the Amoraim (their successors in the following generations) the number given is three. In the funerary inscriptions of classical times, too, quite a number of proselytes are mentioned. Even in the days when Christianity was on its triumphant march to world domination, Judaism often proved itself to be a powerful counter-attraction. Before the rise of Mohammedanism, more than one tribe of the Arabian Peninsula had embraced Judaism. Jewish influence here reached its climax with the conversion to Judaism, about the year 515, of King Dhu Nuwas, the ruler of the Yemen. Two centuries after, we have the famous case of the Khazars—a mixed people, with a strong Mongolian strain, who occupied a territory in what is now the Ukraine, between the Caucasus, the Volga, and the Don. For a period of some 200 years, this was among the most important of the independent states which lay to the north of the Byzantine Empire. Throughout the golden period of the Khazar state it was considered essentially Jewish by its neighbours. At the beginning of the eleventh century it was overwhelmed by an alliance between the Russians and

Byzantines ; but it is thought that the semi-Mongolian features which are relatively common amongst the Jews of this region to the present day are a legacy from these bygone Proselytes. Long after this, a vague tendency towards Judaism continued among the inhabitants of Russia. At the close of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth, this reached its climax in the outbreak of what was known as the "Judaising Heresy." For a time it made enormous progress in mercantile circles, at court, even among the leaders of the Russian Church. There have been such Judaising heresies elsewhere, too. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries there was, for instance, a mass-movement among the Hussite Sectarials in Bohemia to adopt Judaism.

And such infiltration of Gentile blood has continued to the present day, in Europe and elsewhere. "Once a person had embraced Judaism, he was treated in every respect as a born Jew." My friend Melnikoff, for example, Palestine's foremost sculptor, who came there with the Jewish Battalions as a volunteer under Allenby (whose statue in Beersheba, he made) and who is saturated with Hebrew learning and Yiddish folk-idiom, had Gentile grandparents who Judaized.

While on the other side, those Jews who have abandoned Judaism, despite all the Hitlers in the world, despite all the apostles of Jewish nationalism, have ceased to be Jews. Even Hitler stops short after the Jewish grandmother ; below that stage he accepts the convert's descendant as Aryan. Moses Mendelssohn's descendants have not been excluded from German life, because the Mendelssohns dropped Judaism more than three generations back. Where

are Jessica's children to-day ? Would Shylock recognise his descendants ?

Or would he spin elaborate make-believe theories, on the lines of the Brothers Tharaud, who have analysed Charlie Chaplin's work, and found him the typical Jew, who in every stroke reveals his Jewish origin ? It sounds very convincing, only, unfortunately, Chaplin is not a Jew. Just as de Valera is not a Jew, though Mr. St. John Ervine, judging by his features, insists that he is. People have to be judged, the *Catholic Herald* wrote some time ago, by virtue of what they are, of what they are doing, of what they have made themselves, not by virtue of what they were born, of the blood that is in them. " There will be no wholesale entrance for the Irish into the Kingdom of Heaven." And

the Jews that stand for a memory [it continued] are not the Jews that stoned the Prophets, that set up the golden calf, that bowed down in the House of Baal. The Jews that stand for a memory are the Jews that did righteously, the men who held fast to God, and whose passion was a passion for righteousness and for God.

So I hope it will not be held against me that I am one of those Jews who shrink from the challenge of antisemitism, and try to hide behind the protective colouring of " only a religion." I accept Judaism with all its implications. I am an observing Jew, who wraps himself each morning in his praying shawl and wears his phylacteries, and keeps the Sabbath. I have a great love and some knowledge of Judaism and things Jewish, including what is called Jewish culture and Jewish literature, Yiddish and Hebrew. I have been to Palestine, and I have honestly tried to under-

stand the Zionist argument. There was a time when I thought I had succeeded, and I called myself a Zionist. But I discovered that it was only my eagerness to accept everything that came to me claiming to be Jewish. Wise, gentle Louis Zangwill, one of my best-loved friends, who when he was once asked on being introduced as Israel Zangwill's younger brother, whether he wrote as well, replied, "I write better," has pointed out that

We may approach any question with strong opinions, and we may for years debate it without being aware of any weakening, yet in the end we find that conclusions have somehow crystallised themselves in our minds which are often the exact opposite of those with which we began. Our minds, indeed, have a way of working out things without consulting us, and one day we are surprised to find that the particular subject has somehow settled itself for us, quite independent of our initial convictions and our continued expression of them.

I am not sure that I ever did, but to-day, like Israel Zangwill, "I am not content to accept the Jew as a phenomenon purely biological." It is an old Jewish belief that Zangwill expresses, that "Jerusalem, like Heaven, is more a state of mind than a place." I am grateful for the new homes that Palestine has given to some hundreds of thousands of Jews. I have stayed in some of the Jewish labour settlements and I have a great deal of respect for most of the workers there. But I found Palestine to me an alien land. I discovered in Palestine that Palestine is Asia and that I am a European, and that my language and outlook is English. This business of feeling at home is much more complex than it sounds. More things



get through one's pores than one realises. Common language, literature, ways, politics, idioms, love of the same city streets or the same stretch of countryside, common ideas about plumbing and sanitation, mean as much as common descent and religion, and to some people more.

A certain Rabbi I knew, Joel Blau, an ardent Zionist and a fine writer, who is now dead, was called from New York to a big Synagogue in the West End of London.

I thought it only meant buying your ticket from New York to London [he wrote afterwards], and continuing from where you left off on the other side. I thought, foolishly, that it could be done. Why not? What difference does it make? I am here, pretty much the same fellow I was over there. Only I cannot write. My mind is a blank. The only thing I can do in this want-wit condition is to preach. But preaching doesn't require any brains. Anybody can preach—even an American Rabbi. An American Rabbi transplanted to England! The same language. The same people. What difference does it make? Here I have been trying to puzzle out the difference these seven months. And I am not quite sure I know. Something seems to have gone out of my life. A something I am beginning to know only now that I have lost it. Transplanted? Foolish word! A man cannot be transplanted overnight. I am not transplanted. I am uprooted. There was a line of low hills, gently undulating on the New Jersey side, upon which you gazed every morning when you went into your study. And the rhythm of that waving line has somehow worked itself into your soul, almost unawares. They were yours, because you knew them and loved them. And they formed, together with the River Hudson, the background of your life. Where is all this now? And where am I? I not merely lived in this, I lived with it. It was part of me. I have lost

little that may have been valuable in me, in my work. And I haven't acquired a new background. It cannot be expected of me. I discovered America, at last, after leaving it. I had no idea it was so much part of me that I would miss it. I miss it, as an uprooted tree might miss the mother soil.

So it should not be surprising that I heard an old Zionist who had trustfully gone to live in Palestine sadly transpose Yehuda Halevi's famous lament to fit his own case: "I am in the East, but my soul is in the West." I was told by religious Jews that they had never felt in exile until they came to Palestine. I encountered a conglomeration of Jews who belong to twenty different nationalities and races and colours and languages, and despite their common claim to be Jews belong to those other nationalities and races and colours and languages more than they do to anything that I know as Jewish. (We know what hatred there was between German and Belgian or English Jews—even Zionist colleagues and former close personal friends—during the war.) Except in their Synagogues. In the main, I found Palestine an Arab country. And I could not forget that many of these Arabs had murdered Jews, in the riots of 1920, 1921, 1929; and I wondered how soon they would again. On a smaller scale they had never stopped killing Jews. I met the sister of an English Jewess who had with a small party been ambushed and killed. I stood in Yadjur by the grave of the workers who were shot while returning from their work in Haifa. The day I was in Afulah a Jew was stabbed to death there, behind a hayrick, by an Arab. Now again, in April-May 1936, twenty-five Jews have been murdered in the new disturb-

ances. "A Jewish National Home in which the Jew is liable at any minute to be set upon and knifed is not so much a home as a potential lethal chamber," writes the *Jewish Chronicle*. But of course, that is not the whole of the story. Those who are working to build up a Jewish Palestine will not be stopped by murder; they expect that some of the builders will fall, that way or some other way - if not knifed by Arabs, then struck down by malaria while clearing swamps, or caught in blasting operations, or, as one young fellow when I was in Tel Aviv, electrocuted while at work in the Rutenberg station. It is part of the price of building. And if it would lead to the unequivocal building of a real Jewish life in Palestine, and the solving of the Jewish problem, the price would not be too great. But I see that Mr. Arthur Lourie, writing to the Press on April 27th, 1936, as the Political Secretary of the Zionist Organisation, shows that since the Jews have been at work in Palestine, the Arab population has increased.

According to the 1922 census, the Moslem Arabs of Palestine numbered 590,800. According to the 1931 census, they had increased in nine years by 28 per cent. to 759,712, and Government statistics indicate that the natural increase still continues at the very high rate of over 25 per thousand annually. In addition, many thousands of Arabs from outside Palestine have come into the country in search of the employment which the prosperity brought by Jewish immigration has created for all sections of the population. Prior to the War, the numbers of the Arab population of Palestine were practically stationary, and there was a steady stream of emigrants from Palestine to the countries of the New World. That emigration has now almost ceased. I myself met in

Arabs of Palestine to-day, as a result of the improvement in their standard of life and of the country's economic situation generally, which would never have taken place but for the Jewish National Home policy, are more firmly rooted in the country than they ever were.

Indeed, they are. I travelled for miles through depressingly barren and treeless country without a sight of a Jew. In Jerusalem and in Haifa and in Jaffa I received the impression of Arab cities. I saw the Jews in their agricultural settlements, in the Jewish quarters of Jerusalem, of Haifa, in Tel Aviv. I spoke to many who were happy there, to many who loved the land and would never leave it. I found many who were prospering and helping to make the country prosperous. I met others who were deeply disappointed, but determined not to desert their posts. Some simply hated it, and some ran away. There were Zionist officials finding things dull away from London or Paris—like League of Nations officials in Geneva. There is not enough background yet in Palestine. Give us another ten years of building, the enthusiasts say. But meanwhile, I heard creators of Hebrew culture and art grumble that they are working in a void, that there seems no need of them yet, that they are being stunted because the demand is only for unambitious stuff, and that they want to try their artistic strength again where they can be appreciated by their peers.

And the Hebrew University depressed me. It seemed a poor small thing, with a grandiloquent name, that had no roots there. Its organisers no doubt mean it in dead earnest, and Lord Balfour, when he opened it predicted for it "no small or ignoble part in the great harvest of increasing knowledge," but it struck

me, when I saw it last year, as make-believe—not the make-believe, of course, of playing a game, but the pitiful make-believe of trying to carry off more than you can manage. Bergson has said that “To speak of small things as though they were big is always to exaggerate, and exaggeration is comic, if prolonged and systematic.” That seems to me to apply to the Hebrew University, and to some other things in Palestine. There are Zionists, indeed, like de Haas, who find the University “premature.”

For the actual settlers there is the prior physical problem of bread and shelter [he writes]. Before a university can express them they must have accomplished an inner assimilation to themselves and to the land of their choice. There is still the jostle of Sephard, Ashkenaz, Chassid and Yemenite; there are still the natural divisions between Polish, Lithuanian, Hungarian and Oriental Jews intermingled with the natural assertiveness of every type of Western Jew. A generation left to its own devices will by intermarriage produce the composite Palestinian—the Hebrew for whom a Hebrew University will be a natural setting. Pioneers need bread, tools, economic opportunity.

(Dr. Weizmann, indeed, admitted that it seemed “at first sight paradoxical that in a land with so sparse a population, where everything still remains to be done, in a land crying out for such simple things as ploughs, roads and harbours, we should begin by creating a University.”) “Back to the soil and the work bench—that is the implied obligation in the building of the Homeland upon which its success depends,” Mr. de Haas says. “A generation must undertake to lose itself in the wilderness of sheer physical labour.”

This deliberate planting of learning is a new, a

“modern” thing. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, who knows something of Universities, says that

most likely these universities grew as a tree grows from a seed blown by chance of the wind. I surmise the processes at Oxford and Cambridge to have been only a little less fortuitous. Nobody knows how Oxford and Cambridge began. No one knows when they were founded nor out of what schools they grew, nor how Oxford and Cambridge in particular came to be chosen for sites.

· Of course, the false desire for unnecessary “education” is found everywhere. And at the bottom of it, everywhere, as Ruskin found in England, “the cry for it among the lower orders is because they think that when once they have got it, they must become upper orders, and that once give every lad a good education and he cannot but come to ride in his carriage.” And not only among the “lower orders.” There is the desire for what he called “the education befitting such and such a station in life and which shall lead to advancement in life.” And “the great leading error of modern time, the mistaking erudition for education.” It is not only in Palestine that people have to be taught that “in the education either of lower or upper classes it matters not how much or how little they know, provided they know just what will fit them to do their work and to be happy in it.” Even “the general American public is utterly at sea,” says Dr. Abraham Flexner in his important book *Universities*, “as to what education is, where the line should be drawn between mere tricks, vocational training, practical experience and intellectual development.”

But the way in which people rhapsodise about the

University and its view (I found the view from the roof of the Haifa Technicum incomparably more wonderful, but the Principal, my friend Engineer Zaplansky, complained that it was difficult with so much actual building going on to get enough pupils for his building and carpentry and plumbing classes) and about other things in Palestine that need pruning and tending, and not adoration, only shows how most people are prone to believe what they want to believe, to see what they expect to see and to hear what they have come to hear. A good deal of it is the result of years of emotional oratory by fund-raising Palestine publicity speakers who have created an atmosphere of unreal sentimentalism about everything Palestinian. "Woe unto those that have eyes and see not," cries one enthusiast who seems after his trip to have gone back to live in America to expound the miraculous beauty of Palestine. "The Jew who boasts that Palestine leaves him cold discloses a nature incapable of cherishing memories, a temperament devoid of romanticism and a heart impervious to the more subtle and profounder implications of patriotism." Like Alice, I plead that I only said "If." And I didn't boast. There follows a bitter sneer about those Jews who find Palestine uncomfortable because there is no running ice water in the hotel room, and therefore pack up and are off to the fleshpots of Egypt. I think I have heard in Palestine some complaints about wealthy orange-growers and land speculators who have found their fleshpots in Palestine, and the hyperbole is in poor taste when one recalls the many dispossessed and starving Jews in Poland and the Jews humiliated and degraded in Germany who would gladly go to

Palestine to work hard, without asking for fleshpots or running ice water, and cannot get in because of the immigration restrictions. Besides, whatever well-fed enthusiasts say, ordinary people must eat, and if they do not ask for fleshpots, they must at least have bread. Zangwill once said of Palestine, "the mob that asks for bread cannot be put off with a stone, however holy."

It is therefore all to the good that I found in some of the settlements a wholesome desire to emphasise the difficulties, and the hard climbing that has to be done, and to deprecate the excesses of propaganda. There was a desire to mark off the "workers" from the "propagandists."

And workers find themselves faced by humdrum problems, which are more insistent than dogmas and ideals. There is a tendency among some people to return to the methods of witchcraft in this matter of Jewishness and Palestine. They seem to think it is enough to mumble a few words about Jewish consciousness and Jewish regeneration in Palestine and gush about the Haluzim, and hey presto, the trick is done. The trick is not done. Nothing in life is so simple as to be done by tricks. Life is hard work and hard thought, and plenty of drudgery and a great deal of doggedness. People in Palestine have to struggle against odds, like anywhere else; they are tired of it, at times, discontented with what they are doing, and inclined to give it up; some, indeed, give it up, but others stay on, in the same way that most of us stay on in the jobs we have, without any particular fondness for them, because life is made that way, and jobs are that way, and no panacea for unlimited happiness



exists, except in dreams, and propaganda, and novelettes.

I think I should say, in passing, that of all I experienced while I was in Palestine, the great central fact that stands out for me is this: That I visited the Wailing Wall, believed to be the sole remaining part of the Temple, and that I was not moved at all, that I was depressed by it, and wanted to get away, when suddenly I realised that the leader of the service being held at the Wall by a small congregation had started to recite the Sanctification, and almost without knowing it I was at his side, at the Wall, joining in the responses. The place had not affected me. But the familiar words of the Glorification of God had.

These two things stand out in my mind as a result of my visit to Palestine—that I did not feel at home there as I do in England, and this religious impulse at the Wailing Wall, that was not of place, and that has come to me similarly elsewhere, too—in a poor Chassidic prayer-house in Whitechapel, for instance, where I had thought myself an onlooker until the service gripped me.

But if I feel more at home in England (as long as England will have me so) and conform instinctively to all the laws as a decent law-abiding citizen, living at peace with my neighbours, paying my way honestly in my small fashion, and asking nothing for my specific Jewishness but the right to practice my Judaism and keep its observances, and concerned naturally with the fate and the Jewish achievements of those in other lands who practise Judaism, and who are besides, of the same stock, because my parents came thence, and

marry and give in marriage among those of my own faith—a mixed marriage is only the marriage of a Jewish person who retains the Jewish faith with a person who retains another faith—

I can quite understand Jewish people preferring to find their life-companions outside the Jewish fold [I wrote years ago]. Marriage with Jews only is one of the narrowing sacrifices we make to maintain our Jewish faith, and where the faith has gone, the sacrifice and the barrier no longer have any justification—

there are many Jews in other countries who are not allowed to feel at home there. There is, for example, Germany. And there are the countries of Eastern Europe, where Dr. Lestchinsky, the economist, writes :

The Governments of those countries where Jewish masses are starving—those very Governments which demand that Jews should fulfil their duties as full-fledged citizens—not only fail in their duty of creating for the Jewish masses new sources of subsistence, but go out of their way to violate the very laws which presumably guarantee Jews elementary rights as human beings. In all East European countries, for instance, the State banks grant substantial aids to the credit, agricultural and industrial co-operatives. But the Jewish co-operative institutions hardly receive any aid at all. The minute sums occasionally granted them are practically negligible when compared with the percentage of the Jewish population and with the place of the Jewish co-operatives in the general co-operative movement. All the Governments of Eastern Europe are fostering an intensification of rural economy. They offer peasants cheap long-term credits, an accessible literature on rural economy and free agricultural assistance. Jewish peasants cannot enjoy these privileges. In all these semi-agrarian countries professional schools and courses are established, exhibitions are organised in order to raise the level of the professional

training of artisans and to prepare experts for new infant industries. But Jews derive no benefit from these institutions: they are either not admitted, or they keep away of their own accord because of the predominating anti-semitism. Although the Jews contribute their share to the Government revenue, together with the rest of the population, they are compelled to create with their own funds special institutions paralleling those of the State. Under these circumstances the Jewish masses suffer double loss; firstly, Jewish charity, despite its large dimensions, cannot compete with the State apparatus. Secondly, this widely developed and compulsory Jewish charity which is inadequate to satisfy the constantly growing needs of the Jewish masses becomes a heavy burden on the shoulders of Jewish society.

It is not those Jews who feel at home in the lands where they live of whom Herzl was thinking.

Supposing [he wrote] all or some French Jews protest against this plan because they have already been assimilated. My answer is simple: The whole thing does not affect them at all. They are Jewish Frenchmen. Excellent! While this is an internal Jewish affair. The State-building movement I propose would harm the Jewish Frenchmen just as little as the "assimilated" of other countries. On the contrary, it will benefit them! They would be able to assimilate in peace, because the present antisemitism will have been brought to a stop for ever. They will also be believed to be assimilated to their innermost soul if the new Jewish State with its better institutions becomes reality, and they still remain where they are now.

Before the Aliens Commission in London, Dr. Herzl declared: "You must leave it to each man to decide for himself whether he wishes to assimilate or not." As Zangwill's formula, which became that of the Jewish Territorial Organisation, said:

"A territory for those Jews who cannot or will not remain in the lands in which they live at present. For those and those only. Not for those who can or will remain in their present lands. A problem [Zangwill explained in this connection] exists only for those who feel it. Those Jews who will and can remain in the Diaspora prove, ipso facto, that for them the situation is not intolerable.

The point is that there are so many for whom the situation *is* intolerable.

Jews go to Palestine [writes Mr. Zukerman, a well-known American-Jewish journalist] because they are driven from most places and barred from others. It is not of choice, but of dire need. The world must realise that it cannot have it both ways with the Jews. It cannot bait and hunt them in Europe, bar them from America, Africa and Australia and cut off their escape in Asia. Millions of people cannot be trapped like a wild animal. If Germany degrades her Jews, Poland exterminates them, Roumania pogroms them, the United States imposes quotas on them, surely they should be allowed to go to Palestine. Even in hunting there are the rules of the game, and one of them is that the hunted animal must be given a sporting chance. Palestine is perhaps the one small sporting chance left to this hunted people, struggling to escape from the tragic position which the world itself has created.

## CHAPTER V

### DIASPORA AND PALESTINE

I AM the last man to suggest that only Jews have been or are persecuted and suffering.

While the bloody code of Elizabeth was enforced against the English Roman Catholics, what was the patriotism of Roman Catholics? [Macaulay asked]. It was the same with the Calvinists. What more deadly enemies had France in the days of Louis the Fourteenth than the persecuted Huguenots? But would any rational man infer from these facts that either the Roman Catholic as such or the Calvinist as such is incapable of loving the land of his birth?

In the Cevennes, "Black Camisard and White Camisard, Protestant prophet and Catholic cadet of the White Cross, they had all been sabring and shooting, burning, pillaging and murdering, their hearts hot with indignant passion; and after a hundred and seventy years," Stevenson found "Protestant still Protestant, Catholic still Catholic, in mutual toleration and mild amity of life." In 1930 there were some terrible stories published in the Press about the Polish "Pacification of the Ukraine."

Punitive expeditions were sent into the villages. Houses were ransacked, agricultural implements destroyed, the co-operative stores ransacked, the goods scattered and

strewn with petroleum. Ukrainian peasants were driven by blows to overthrow the monument erected to the Ukrainian poet Szewzzenko. The inhabitants fled into the woods, but those who were not able to make good their escape were battered by the invaders and left more dead than alive. These appalling events which are reminiscent of barbaric times vie in horror with things that have darkened the pages of history.

In Eastern Macedonia, after the war, the Inter-Allied Commission reported :

It now appears certain that Bulgaria had one aim—the destruction of the Greek Orthodox population. Stories of wholesale slaughter by gun-fire or other violent means make an impression on the reader, on account of the picture they call up of torn bodies and pools of blood ; but, in our opinion, the brutality of such crimes does not compare in cruelty with those which consist in condemning thousands of harmless people to death by starvation after long and agonising suffering. As for the deportations, they were carried out, not as a measure of safety, but as a means of extermination ; more than a quarter of the deported males succumbed to privation, to blows, torture or excessive toil.

It sounds very reminiscent of the evacuations of the Jewish population of the Russian Pale during the war—

driving out whole populations at a few hours' notice from their homes and possessions ; turning some six hundred thousand into vagabonds and mendicants. The sick, including women in childbirth and cases of contagious disease, were dragged from their beds, the orphans from asylums, the lunatics from the madhouses, and such as could be packed in any goods trucks available were sent off without food or water with letters of consignment like goods ; the others, men, women and children, had to go afoot through the wintry roads. If a baby died on the way the parents

could not stop to bury it ; if the typhus patients died in the train, the bodies were not removed.

And "condemning thousands of harmless people to death by starvation"—that is what is being done now to the Jews in Germany and in Poland and other East European countries, either deliberately or by force of circumstances. But it has been done and is being done also to others than Jews. Professor Gilbert Murray has told us how in his first years as a delegate to the League of Nations Assembly it fell to him to see Armenians, Georgians, Ukrainians, Macedonians, waiting to tell one quietly their terrible stories of massacre and torture. Of the Armenians, Zangwill wrote : "Hitherto, the crown of martyrdom has been pre-eminently Israel's. But one people is suffering more. I take the crown of thorns from Israel's head and I place it upon Armenia's."

I have not forgotten the sufferings of the old Russian serfs, the grinding poverty of the Polish or Roumanian peasants, the famines in Ireland, or on the Volga, or in China, the starvation in the Ruhr, or the distressed areas in England. I have not forgotten that the Russian Revolution drove into exile, and for most of them into poverty and demoralisation nearly two million Russians, so-called "Whites" (a good many Jews among them, too), though never in history could there have been so many people in any country actively political to the extent of refusing acceptance of the dominant régime, if only it gave them bread and peace. And I have not forgotten the 30 million unemployed there are now in the world.

Not everybody has overlooked the suffering, actual starvation, not only national humiliation, that in

Germany paved the way to Hitlerism. Vernon Bartlett, when he was in the Ruhr in 1920, alarmed the head-waiter in his hotel in Duesseldorf, when once he "pulled back the restaurant curtains, and so, unthinkingly, enabled the hungry poor to see the diners and the dinner tables . . . this great, industrial area with its wan, pinched faces." More recently, not long before Hitlerism came in, Max Brod, in one of his finest novels, unfortunately not yet translated into English, sent his principal character into one of the famine districts :

A decent, sensible, industrious, capable population, gifted with music and inner rhythm—and condemned to death, to rot. Factories silent, the dead buildings like corpses in the beautiful wooded valleys. Railway lines going to rust. The people with wan faces, ill because they have nothing to eat. It is as simple as that. There is a shortage of shoes, of stockings. The homes—poky cellars, breathing pestilence. Commissions of investigation come and go, but the inhabitants must remain. The baker used to have two ovens going ; now he is glad if he can bake in one of them once a week. Even the dog-butcher has no customers, people can't afford to eat dogs' or cats' meat. The hospitals are packed—three children with diphtheria in one bed. What he saw in the villages was terrible. The disease-ridden cellars were not so frightening as the clean huts on the mountain-side, among trees, with good air, in the midst of idyllic scenery. And all these people doomed to die. They do not shout ; they sit in their rooms, they have nothing to do, they wait—to die of starvation. He was ashamed to look them in the face. And they do not speak. Only once, a desperate man started up as he came in, and cried : " We're only waiting for another war, so that we can give it them ! " And then he added : " Best thing would be if a bomb came, and blew the whole place to smithereens." " Yes, there used to be rich mines there, and a musical instrument



ndustry that supplied the whole world. Everybody had work." "Now I have pawned the last thing I had left, my cornet." "If things get any worse it will be just impossible."

But there are also millions of Jews in a similar plight—economically displaced, ostracised, degraded, unwanted population—millions of human beings, able and willing, if given the chance, to be productive and to create important human and economic values for the lands that will give them a chance.

I do not believe that all of them would have to leave their native countries or would wish to leave them. It is a question of relieving the pressure of population, of drawing off some of the congestion, non-Jewish as well as Jewish. The great majority of the Jewish populations of the various countries will remain, I think, where they are. Even if things go badly with them.

They have their graves in these places for centuries. And they will add their own to them. "At our feet the silent dust of them that were before us." Their fathers' and fathers' fathers' dust. More near and dear than the precious dust of Bible times that lies in Palestine. Troubles and persecutions have visited them before, and they, or some of them, remained. And so to-day, too. Some will remain still, despite of all. Chmielnicki's Cossacks in 1649 massacred 300,000 Jews in the Ukraine. But the Ukraine remained one of the great centres of Jewish population. In 1903 and 1904 there were again pogroms in the Ukraine, in Kishinev, in Odessa and elsewhere. In 1919 there were more massacres of Jews in the Ukraine, under Denikin and Petlura.

Two million Jews were literally crushed between the millstones of civil war and revolution in the Ukraine [writes the Jewish historian, Dubnov]. In Jewish history the year 1919 was an edition of the dreadful time of 1648. From December 1918 till April 1921, the Ukraine witnessed eight hundred and eighty-seven large pogroms, and three hundred and forty-nine minor excesses. The Jewish communities affected numbered five hundred and thirty. The total number of Jews slain was about sixty thousand, and as many more Jews were maimed and crippled.

(Though there, too, "Ukrainians, not only Jews, were persecuted and starved out by the various contending legions, and large parts of Ukrainian territory became a sort of No-Man's-Land, where various bandit groups preyed upon the people.")

Yet to-day, the Ukraine is still one of the largest centres of Jewish population, numbering over one and a half million people, with a number of important new autonomous Jewish agricultural regions, and with large Jewish populations in the cities of Odessa, Kiev and Charkoff.

In Germany, France, Italy, Bohemia, the Jews were massacred, persecuted, exiled. Zunz, in his *Sufferings of the Jews during the Middle Ages*, describes the harrowing scenes. Yet as soon as the massacres were stayed, the Jews came back to their places. I have no doubt that when the present cult of violence is ended and the economic troubles of the post-war period that gave rise to it have passed, the great majority of Jewish citizens will be found in their various countries, at their posts, ready to take their part in the new constructive work. Whatever we may think of conditions in Soviet Russia to-day, one thing is clear, that there is no discrimination against

Jews as Jews. They are equal citizens with the rest. And whether conditions are good or bad, the Jews find them no better and no worse than any others. Pogromist Russia in a few years has been transformed in this respect. And who shall say this is impossible elsewhere? The White Terror against the Jews in Hungary that in 1921 shocked the world no less than what is happening to-day in Germany, is now but a horrible memory.

Through hundreds of years Jews have lived in their native places in the various European countries, have loved their native soil, have suffered, some of them, emigrated, some of them, intermingled, some of them, but the bulk of them have remained where they were, and have remained Jews. The names of European towns and villages have become proud Jewish family names. And the lives of the Jews who have lived in these European towns and villages constitute Jewish history of the last two thousand years, a much longer and much greater, certainly a much nearer epoch than Jewish history in Palestine.

No one can know what might have been had history taken a different course. But the thought has occurred to many, that had Judaism remained only in Palestine, had there been no dispersion, no intermingling of thought, and perhaps of blood, no transplanting to Babylonian, Persian, Greek, European and American soil, Judaism might have stagnated and come to be no more than the Samaritans are to-day, an interesting relic of the distant past. Our very Judaism is no longer the Temple cult it was in Palestine, but centres round the Synagogue, the creation of the Dispersion.

rebuilders of Zion, of Yehuda Halevi, of Pinsker, of Herzl, Nordau, Weizmann, Sokolov, Jabotinsky, and of the rank and file of the Zionist movement come not from Palestine but from the cities and towns of Europe. "The Republic has created no Republicans. It is absolute Government that makes Republicans." It is not Palestine that rebuilds Zion, but the Diaspora that rebuilds it. It is from the Diaspora that the Haluzim come. Dr. Weizmann has said it : "The Czar trained pioneers for Palestine."

There are few people anywhere who will deny the right of Jews to go to Palestine, and to build up Jewish life in the land that was the cradle of Judaism. Above all, to-day when, however much they would prefer to stay in their native lands, many Jews, like other non-Jewish surplus population, can find no economic foothold there, and are compelled to seek new homes elsewhere, and Palestine is about the only country in the world that still admits a large number of Jewish immigrants. As a Jewish Labour memorandum on the question of Jewish immigration submitted to the British Government a few years back pointed out :

The economic, political and social conditions in many countries of Europe are hopeless for the mass of Jewry, and especially for Jewish Labour, and hundreds of thousands of Jews look to emigration as the immediate solution of their problem. Leaving aside all political questions, from the standpoint of immigration alone, Palestine has become a most powerful factor, and it is to Palestine that those Jews who seek refuge have turned to an increasing extent. The psychological effect of the Mandate establishing Palestine as a Jewish national home must also be kept in mind. Palestine is the only country into which immigration and settlement of Jewish people

is considered as a right and not a special privilege. But it is not only because of formal and legal obligations that immigration into Palestine must be facilitated, but also because the vital needs of masses of Jewish workers in many parts of the world, and especially in Eastern Europe demand that this outlet for the need of Jewish Labour emigration should not be closed.

That is very clear. Yet it is impossible to avoid the question whether there is sufficient outlet in Palestine for the need of Jewish Labour (and other) emigration. Mr. Ben Gurion, the leader of the Palestine Labour movement, expressing his hopes in an address to the last Zionist Congress of "what our generation should achieve in the next twenty-five or thirty years" suggested that

the goal for this generation's work is to enable a million Jewish families to take root in Eretz Israel. Nothing is easier [he went on] than to express so great an aim—yet if we lack the courage and the strength to accomplish this partial but decisive purpose of Zionism, in spite of all the frightful difficulties, all this great talk is nothing more than pretty phrases.

Let us assume that we had a million Jewish families who would immediately go to Palestine—perhaps to-day there are even more than that number ready—let us assume that a miracle might happen, that the gates of Eretz Israel were opened wide and that we had enough ships to carry a million people. Assuming all this, there are not to-day the million Jews who can live and subsist in Eretz Israel. It does not matter from what part of Jewry you might draw this million, from Poland, Russia, Germany, they could not subsist in Eretz Israel. For in Eretz Israel a million Jewish merchants, teachers, lawyers, doctors and writers cannot and will not subsist. The preponderant majority of these million people must be Jewish farmers, workers and artisans. If we believe that Zionism is not a sentiment and not a museum piece, but the tremendous

business of rescuing the masses of the Jewish people, we must prepare the people for this enormous change which has to take place in their lives.

It may be remarked at this point, in passing, that this is what is being done in Soviet Russia, where what is called productivisation of the Jewish masses as a change-over from small-trading and the middleman pursuits is not urged by Zionist ideology but is compelled by Government decree and Soviet conditions. As a well-known Jewish journalist has expressed it :

For generations the Jews had been kept by force from all productive occupations, confined almost entirely to petty trading and commerce, and both these occupations were swept away by the tremendous changes introduced by the Soviet Government. Trading was practically prohibited in Russia and commerce, foreign and home alike, was taken over as a monopoly of the State. Economically the Jews were consequently worse hit by the Revolution than any other people. The Soviet Government, even if it realised the despairing need of these people, could not, however, call a halt to its entire programme of social reconstruction because it happened to affect adversely three million Jews. It was their misfortune to be in the way of the chariot of the Revolution. The only thing the Government did for them was to offer them the means of changing their economic position from one running counter to the Revolution to one moving in accord with it. Thus from 1924, the Soviet Government has been promoting land settlement of the Jews with the help of the big Jewish relief organisations of Europe and America. Side by side with the Jewish colonisation movement and more important still is the Jewish industrialisation movement. The gigantic factories and plants which were springing up all over Russia under the Five Year Plan which is converting the agricultural country into an industrial State, were clamouring for workers and the Jews found their way inside. As a result 46·7 per cent of the Jewish population

of Russia are wage-earners, 43 per cent of this new proletariat is connected with heavy industry, and the former preponderance of Jews in the tailoring and shoemaking industries has been changed to a predominance in the metallurgical industries. Trading has been abolished as a source of income among the Jews of Soviet Russia.

There was the force of a Government system behind it in Russia. But in Palestine, "we are a voluntary movement," as Dr. Weizmann, the President of the Zionist Organisation, has said. And on the economic side, Mr. Jabotinsky, the leader of the New Zionist Organisation, has expressed Mr. Ben Gurion's idea in a different way, from the middle-class point of view, but just as fundamentally :

An immigrant becomes a "settler" not only after he has begun to produce, but has also found a market for selling his produce—until that moment he is only a "tourist" in danger of losing his foothold in the country and being forced to leave. The absorptive capacity of a country is determined not by acres but by the marketing possibilities. From this point of view, the 100,000 new immigrants who have arrived in Palestine during the last few years are still far from having all become "settlers." To justify commercially their own upkeep, they should earn—i.e. both produce and sell something like seven million pounds in value per year.

This question of how many Jews it is possible to settle in Palestine within the immediate future is one upon which there is a considerable divergence of opinion within the Zionist ranks. But there is no suggestion anywhere that Palestine can at once cope with and settle the problem of finding a home and employment for all the surplus Jewish population of Europe.

Those who wish to build Palestine in an hour are weaklings [says Dr. Weizmann]. Countries will stay if they are built slowly. We cannot compromise the future of Palestine for the sake of a hundred more immigrants, however valuable every single immigrant is to me.

I leave out of consideration all the various other problems that arise in connection with the Palestine settlement work, such as the Arab problem, not so much in Palestine itself alone, as in the adjoining countries, the overwhelmingly Arab character of the Arab Peninsula and the danger of Jewish assimilation to the preponderant culture of that part of the world, inevitable wherever the native culture, as in Arabia, is not decaying in numbers or vitality, but is thriving, and quite irrespective of which is the higher or the lower culture. And I fear, too, the Levantine influence.

There are Zionists who have no doubts at all about the ultimate goal of Zionism being reached, even to the extent of a Jewish State, or shall we say a self-governing autonomous Jewish Dominion within the British Commonwealth. Dr. Weizmann, on the other hand, is one of those who say—"What people mean when they talk of a Jewish State in Palestine I cannot imagine." "We recognise that Palestine is going to be the common homeland of the Jews and Arabs." "Palestine could become a Jewish State if it were an uninhabited country. But it is not an uninhabited country." Mr. Leonard Stein, in his book *Zionism*, writes :

It would be idle to dogmatise as to what may or may not happen in an unforeseeable future. It is conceivable that the development of Palestine may proceed with unexpected rapidity, and may enable the Jews to settle in numbers which now seem fantastic. But from the facts



at present available there is only one inference to be drawn. Palestine will find room in course of time for some hundreds of thousands of Jewish immigrants; it will become a country in which the Jews form a much larger percentage of the population than in any other part of the world; but there is little likelihood of its absorbing them in such numbers as will make them an actual majority. These facts must be faced, but to regard them as fatal to Zionist hopes implies a somewhat crude and mechanical conception of the Jewish national home.

Mr. Jabotinsky rejects all such reasoning, and proclaims boldly that

the true meaning of the National Home formula employed in the Balfour Declaration was not to create one more ghetto but to assist in reconstituting for the Jews what is the only normal form of a people's existence—a Jewish State with a Jewish majority; not to build an Arab country at the expense of Jewish effort and capital, but to help to end once and for all the tragedy of Jewish homelessness and the horror of Jewish world distress. Palestine, within its natural and historic frontiers on both sides of the Jordan is fully capable of providing such a complete solution of the Jewish problem. The Jews have proved that Palestine's economic capacity to absorb immigrants cannot be measured only by the number of its acres, that capacity depends above all on the quality of the human material. The essential condition, however, is the opening of Trans-jordan for Jewish immigration and settlement.

The editor of the *Menorah Journal*, who is also Chancellor of the Menorah Association which works among the Jewish students in American colleges and universities, writes in his magazine:

Every cool mind must see by now, in the light of events, that the political movement for a Jewish State in Palestine has been a hopeless aberration. Everything depends upon its interpretation. Interpreted in terms of Herzl and

Jabotinsky, it was bound to lead to disillusionment and disaster. Interpreted in terms of Achad Ha'am and Aaron David Gordon and Chancellor Magnes of the Hebrew University, it may yet serve as the constitutional basis of a corporate Jewish life in Palestine. This, broadly, is Cultural Zionism. Of course, it requires autonomy and security in the land—to this extent, indeed, it must be based on political rights and safeguards. But it has no ambition to be sole master of Palestine, or to play a rôle in the Society of Nations save as an integral part of a bi-national Palestine State, of both Jewish and Arab communities, which it is hoped will come into being.

But elsewhere he exclaims: "Zionism or no Zionism, the four million Jews in America must somehow work out a decent life as Jews."

"I wonder where the ecclesiastic authority as to who is and who is not a Zionist rests," Chancellor Magnes asks in his pamphlet *Like all the Nations?* And he sums up his own view by saying,

I should like the Palestinian nationality to mean that Palestine is no place for an Arab State or a Jewish State or a British State, but a place where all together will create an international, interreligious and inter-racial home. The Jews can achieve Palestine as a spiritual centre of the Jewish people.

Achad Ha'am, the father and still the most important figure of spiritual Zionism, defined his ideal in the following words:

A national spiritual centre of Judaism to which all Jews will turn with affection, and which will bind all Jews together; a centre of study and learning, of language and literature, of bodily work and spiritual purification; a true miniature of the people of Israel as it ought to be, so that every Hebrew in the Diaspora will think it a privilege to behold just once the centre of Judaism and when

he returns home will say to his friends: "If you wish to see the genuine type of a Jew, whether it be a Rabbi or a scholar or a writer, a farmer or an artist or a business man—then go to Palestine and you will see it."

Rabbi Milton Steinberg, in his book, *The Making of the Modern Jew*, puts it this way:

The typical Zionist to-day neither desires nor expects all Jews to return to Palestine. He looks to that land for a reborn culture which shall enable him to preserve and enrich his own Judaism in the lands of the Dispersion. The very word "nationalism" which characterises the essence of Zionist thought is generally employed by Zionists in the sense in which Achad Ha'am used it. It carries no connotation of political allegiance. When the American or British Zionist asserts that the Jew is a member of a Jewish nation, he does not imply that he accepts any political obligations beyond citizenship in the lands in which he lives.

It sounds a quibble to me, but I have no doubt that to "the typical Zionist" it is all very clear. But it occurs to me that among a number of papers that have come to me from Zangwill's library, I have a copy of an old issue of the *Menorah Journal*, on the margins of which Zangwill has made notes against an article which *inter alia* says:

Palestine is to be built as a model Jewish centre on purely religious and cultural lines. It is not to be the home of all the Jewish people. The Zionist does not believe that there is a necessary conflict between a cultural allegiance to the Jewish centre and political allegiance to a State.

Zangwill remarked at this point: "If not a full State it is no more a model than a Catholic priest."

Incidentally, there is, too, a great deal of divergence among Jews about the precise nature of a spiritual

Jewish centre, and what constitutes what may be described as spiritually Jewish. It would hardly be mere nostalgia, such as inspired Ludwig Lewisohn to write :

To me in my own person, the land of Palestine had a deeper and subtler message. Here, at last, was my earth. I felt it at once. I knew. Never, I dare say, shall I be able to dwell upon that earth. It does not matter. At last I knew, no longer as a theory but as a living fact, the ultimate meaning of exile, and the element which constitutes that exile for us by our lack of it.

And I doubt whether it would be the simple philanthropy of Zionists like Major H. L. Nathan (ex-M.P.) who, answering the "sneers at the unwillingness of distinguished members of the Jewish faith to give up their prestige and possessions and spend the rest of their lives extracting a scanty living from the soil of Palestine," explains that Palestine is only "for the poor outcast in the back streets of Polish cities. Palestine, in the eyes of Zionists," he declares, "is not a place of exile for the exalted; it is to be a city of refuge for the oppressed."

The rigidly orthodox Jews of the Agudath Israel proclaim, like Zangwill, that the Torah is the only Jewish centre.

The first aim of Zionism [says their spokesman, Dr. Breuer] is the establishment of a secular sphere within the Jewish community. The determining fact is the Jewish people shall voluntarily get away from God and the Torah at some point. It is just this vital point of the relation of the religious to the secular in Judaism at which Jewish ideology diverges from Zionist ideology. There is no separation of "secular" from "religious" matters for the Jewish people.

I am afraid that the Zionist who seeks on the one hand a Jewish centre in Palestine, and poses the possibility of a Jewish allegiance other than the allegiance to Judaism, and on the other hand does not wish to give up anything he enjoys in his political allegiance to a State and has no belief in the establishment of a Jewish State "capable of providing a complete solution of the Jewish problem," gives point to a question like this put by Hillaire Belloc:

What would be the status of the Jew outside the Territorial unit? That is the question which everybody hesitates to face, yet that is the question which will have to be faced sooner or later as the main political crux of the Zionist experiment.

Of course, there are, for instance, Irishmen who are subjects and citizens of the United States of America. But Zangwill faced that question in his own way.

What will be the status of a Jew who becomes a citizen of the new British State in Palestine? [he asked]. It will not prevent the Jews of Palestine being regarded as British by the rest of the world, while the Jewries of the Diaspora, from all of which energies and finances will be streaming towards Palestine, can scarcely escape being regarded as pro-British. The peril of such a situation for non-British Jews in the event of a war between England and other Powers possessing Jewish populations needs no accentuation. The risks that will arise to foreign Jewries from their supposed pro-Britishism and to Palestine Jews from their residence in the unholy land of religious and political rivalries would have been worth running [he went on] had Israel really achieved, or could he really achieve independence there. But the autonomy that lies in numbers is a dubious and distant goal, and for generations Israel falls between two stools, neither British nor non-British, neither bond nor free.

Dr. Solomon Goldman, reviewing very warmly in the *B'nai B'rith Magazine* the achievements of the Zionist movement at the time Lord Balfour died, remarked :

What movement ever received so many grievous setbacks in such a meagre span of years? Zionists were quite naturally hard pressed to maintain discipline and enthusiasm. The magic words Balfour Declaration, San Remo decision, Halutz, which for a time were packing mass meetings and assuring orators a climax, became hackneyed. The trials were overwhelming, the failures disheartening.

But Jews have known trials and failures in Palestine before, and many of them did not become disheartened. There are in all movements, ideas and men I like, and one of these men, Berl Katznelson, who is a leader of Palestine Labour, once said at a Zionist Congress :

The Labour movement in Zionism arose in the most difficult years of the Zionist movement, in the years after Uganda, when all political roads were closed against us, at a time when the Jewish youth in Eastern Europe was involved in the Russian revolutionary movement, when the leader of Zionism was dead and the movement was on the verge of collapse. At that time Zionism was saved by that small group that turned from the facile road of Charterism and diplomacy, took the slow and difficult road to Palestine and began by its work to create positive foundations for our economic life, our immigration, our culture and our political future. I speak in the name of the movement that underwent the régime of Abdul Hamid and the "red ticket," that stood at its post in the years of the war and the Occupation, that created the Hashomer and the Jewish self-defence, that gave Zionism Tel Hai and fighters under illegal conditions in Czarist and Soviet Russia.

Though Katznelson's Zionist Labour Party and

Jabotinsky's Zionist Revisionist Party are now wider apart and more hostile to each other than many Zionists and non-Zionists are, I who belong to neither party, but count both men as my friends, cannot express my admiration of the one without emphasising that Jabotinsky, too, has played a proud and heroic part in their common movement. His policy was bold when he, "neither a British Subject, nor an immigrant, who had never been in the United Kingdom or in any British Dominion before the war, without any support from any British source," conducted pro-British propaganda among neutral and Russian Jewry, and was the leading spirit in organising the Jewish battalions to fight in the British army for the conquest of Palestine, and many of the Labour leaders fought with him. Trumpeldor belonged to them both. And it was he who led the Jewish self-defence in Jerusalem in 1920, and was sentenced for it to fifteen years' imprisonment, only the outcry was such that the sentence was quashed and he went free. In the same way he was bold and consistent when in 1923 he resigned from the Zionist Executive because he could not pay lip service to methods he hated. Whatever may be thought of his policy, I who know him and respect him as a man regret the cry of "Fascist" hurled at him without justification, though he has repeatedly repudiated the implication:

I stand by a democratic organisation. I view with contempt Hitlerism. I am an opponent of aggressive nationalism or militarism. I am a journalist who would choke without freedom of the Press. Fascism is wholly and inorganically inapplicable to any aspect of Jewish life; it is therefore dishonest to call any Jewish Party "Fascist."

Though there are Jews who subscribe to Fascism as citizens in Fascist countries, and have even battled for it there, "Fascism is to-day the official doctrine of Italy, and Italy is one of those countries where Jews enjoy full equality, not only politically but socially."

But to come back to what Zangwill said about Jewish Pro-Britishism, one might well quote his illuminating suggestion that "much of the present Zionism in the wealthier circles of Anglo-Jewry has its origin in their British patriotism and their patriotic fervour for the extension of the British Empire in the East." The *Jewish Guardian* wrote in its editorial of November 14, 1924 :

We do not recede from the position, which we have defended more than once in the *Jewish Guardian* (sometimes even in excess of the patience of some of our non-Zionist friends), that, so far as the Palestine experiment is a British enterprise directed partly to Jewish welfare, it demands the generous gratitude of Englishmen of the Jewish religion. The *Keren Hayesod* seeks money from British Jews in order to settle in Palestine some of the nationally unassorted Jews who very reasonably prefer the prospect of Palestinian nationality to the inhospitable embraces of the step-motherlands which they are quitting. The readjustment of the Jewish population of certain European countries is still an unsolved after-war problem, and, obviously, it must partly be solved by Jewish effort. And because the generous action of England has facilitated the solution in the final stage, by associating a new national home for some of those nationally unassorted Jews with the ancient places of our religion, it is particularly the duty of English Jews to ensure the success of that experiment.

I am very far from accepting any of the divergent Zionist dogmas or the various degrees of the Palestine



solution. And I am not deterred from expressing my doubts by the vehement denunciations of separatist thought or action by a famous Zionist leader who happens to be a friend of mine. I do not lightly court Dr. Weizmann's reproach : " Everybody is an expert on Palestine. Palestine is game for everybody." God forbid that anything Jewish or anything human or constructive anywhere should be game to me ! The reproach stings, but I ease my conscience by recalling Zangwill's very true observation, that " the evasion of all root questions in the interests of a sham unity will one day have to be paid for, and with heavy interest."

There is much talk to-day of a united Jewish front—in support of Zionism—a sort of would-be totalitarian Jewish representation, with one single Jewish outlook and one single Jewish plan. But is it not impossible for any large group of people ever to agree upon any one plan ? It was not even possible to preserve for long the sacred united front of the war period. And Zionists, in particular, were at one time the last people in the world to accept the doctrine of one disciplined united front. If they had, there never would have been a Zionist Organisation. The First Zionist Congress met against the very strongly expressed wishes of the great majority of the representative Jews and Jewish organisations of the time, and in defiance of their protests. Dr. Bodenheimer, who delivered the address on Organisation at the First Congress, had to deal with the objection that there was no need of a new Jewish Organisation. He answered it by saying that the existing Jewish communities were separate bodies and not a national unity, while the Organisa-

tions like the Alliance Israelite Universelle or the B'nai B'rith stood on the principle of assimilation. Fourteen years later, in 1911, at the Tenth Zionist Congress, Adolf Boehm still had to remind it that it was always a handful of people, never a multitude, who had won the world over to their ideas. Zionists have continually, as a minority in the Jewish communities, fought vehemently for their own aims and for the appropriation of funds for their work. They still do. In Germany, the Zionists are to-day demanding a larger share of control of the Jewish communities, more in keeping with the growth of Zionist feeling since Hitler. And Zionists still keep calling upon the Jewish Colonisation Association to place its millions at the disposal of the Zionist colonisation work in Palestine. The question was actually debated at the German Zionist Conference held in February 1936. And as recently as the end of April, Mr. Neville Laski, K.C., the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, alluded to this matter, when he asked at a meeting of the Board whether the organisers of the projected Jewish World Congress (mostly Zionists) thought that control of the funds of the Jewish Colonisation Association and other organisations would be handed over to them, and declared that it would be a snare and a delusion to think so. Zangwill has written that it was part of his fight for Zionism in the early days to try to secure a part of the funds of the Jewish Colonisation Association for the work in Palestine.

But all this talk about a united Jewish front overlooks the fact that in Jewish life and law and practice there is no such thing as a centralised Jewish body,

religious or secular. There is certainly no Jewish church, with a hierarchy, and a centralised Rabbinate, and ecclesiastical or administrative government. Each congregation of ten Jews or more is autonomous, completely independent, and may elect its own Rabbi and arrange its own service. Judaism has only the Torah. The Rabbi is not a priest. The priesthood passed with the Temple. Even the Rabbinical diploma, unlike Christian ordination, confers no sacred power and is not a licence. It is simply a testimonial of the ability of the holder to act as Rabbi if he wishes and is elected. The fact is, the Unions of Jewish Congregations are only deliberative, and have no power to enforce any decisions. The institution of the Chief Rabbi and of centralised country-wide or Empire-wide communities is only designed for the improvement of the administrative and financial conduct of the Synagogue, where it is not influenced by a desire to imitate the example of church organisation, and it is not Jewishly binding.

Moreover, it is an old story that the very people who are so anxious to set up the authority of one united will, would be the most unhappy under it. Bagehot remarked it when he wrote: "At this very moment there are the most rigid Comtists teaching that we ought to be governed by a hierarchy. Yet who can doubt that Comte would have been hanged by his own hierarchy." Free discussion and the right to differ are indispensable, if we are to do anything worth while. We are not yet mental slaves to be driven by the taskmaster. Though "we have now a return to the period of authoritative usage and an abandonment of the classical habit of independent and

self-choosing thought." And remember : " Old things need not be true, O brother men, nor yet the new."

Who to-day does not respect Romain Rolland and those who shared his minority stand during the war ? Let me recall what he wrote at the time : " For a year I have been rich in enemies. I have no concern with them. My business is to say what I believe to be fair and humane. Whether this pleases or irritates is not my business."

And in Zionism, above all, " the basis of all social and political development is criticism," Dr. Alfred Nossig wrote over thirty years ago in the Zionist miscellany, *The Voice of Truth*.

Mr. Samuel J. Rosensohn, a prominent American Zionist, has more recently written :

In the Zionist movement, as in all great movements, there are two conflicting groups—one consisting of those who are governed by the spirit of loyalty and devotion to the cause and to its leaders whom they identify with the cause ; and the other made up of those who adopt a critical attitude to the movement and subject the movement and its leadership to the test of the realities. The reverential attitude, when deserved, is of great value to a movement ; but the only security against undeserved loyalty is to be found in those enquiring minds who take nothing for granted and subject every cause to the tests of reason and reality. By the ardent and enthusiastic Zionist who can see no defect in his cause and no fault in its leaders the critic is regarded as insolent, disloyal and almost a blasphemer. This attitude of unquestioning loyalty often endangers the movement itself. It is only through a harmonising of these attitudes that any movement can be preserved.

I wince, it is true, when people say—

You want to help those Jews who have no hope in the

lands where they are now. What real hope is there for them except in Palestine, which is the only country that is actually absorbing large number of Jewish immigrants? What other country is admitting any considerable number of Jewish immigrants? We must not dissipate our forces. It needs all the money and all the efforts we can give, else the pace will slacken down. Even now, concentrating everything on Palestine it is hard enough to meet the Budget. And we are on test before the world. We have to justify the trust given us in Palestine. We cannot afford to split our forces and risk failure there.

I admit the force of the argument. But there are other arguments that seem to me equally forcible. I know that I keep quoting Zangwill, but that is because he had covered the ground so very thoroughly long before I came to till this plot. "When a person of fair character for literary honesty uses an image such as another has employed before him," as Oliver Wendell Holmes would say, he should give credit to his predecessor, if he knows of him, even if he has struck upon it independently, especially when that predecessor happens to have been his friend and teacher. "The Jewish State is something in the future—something to be generated in the womb of time," says Zangwill. "The Diaspora is actually here." And it is not possible for Palestine, say what you will, to solve the problem of the need of the millions of Jews who must be provided with new homes. As Mr. Ben Gurion, whom I have quoted previously has said :

Let us assume that we had a million Jewish families who would immediately go to Palestine—perhaps to-day there are even more than that number ready—let us assume that a miracle might happen, that the gates of Eretz Israel were opened wide and that we had enough ships to carry

a million people. Assuming all this, there are not to-day the million Jews who can live and subsist in Eretz Israel.

And Mr. Ben Gurion knows what he is talking about, for he is in charge of the actual work in Palestine.

Those Zionists who speak airily of Palestine as if it were a kind of miraculous cure-all, an infallible automatic slot-machine, that works wonders if only it is kept supplied with sufficient coin, are no doubt very well-meaning folk, only "there is nothing more blinding than the blinding light of an ideal."

## CHAPTER VI

### BIRO-BIDJAN

THAT is true, of course, not only of the Zionist ideal. A very good friend of mine, Mr. Ovedoff, the editor of a Jewish paper in South Africa, who is an enthusiast for the Jewish Colonisation movement in Russia, writes in the *South African Jewish Chronicle* thus:

The phenomenal success of the Jewish Colonisation movement in Russia has silenced all opposition. In a short period of three years 110,000 Jews were settled on the land, and one and all of these 110,000 were but a little while ago starving in the towns and townlets of Russia. The fact that millions of people are crying out for help and that their land settlement is the only hope alive, could not fail to appeal. The industrialisation of the Jewish masses of Russia is also progressing satisfactorily. The number of Jews in employment in the industries of the country exceed 1,000,000 souls. And now, since the allotment of Biro-Bidjan with the view of establishing an autonomous Jewish State in the Soviet Union, the whole prospect of the Jewish future in Russia is more hopeful.

The small cart of the Jewish economic problem in Russia has been hitched up to the huge motor lorry of Russian reconstruction [writes another journalist friend of mine, William Zukerman, in the *Contemporary Review*], with the result that it is being dragged out now from the mire of centuries towards the high road which leads to a complete solution of the Jewish difficulties.

There are even greater enthusiasts than either Ovedoff or Zukerman. One, Otto Heller, prophesies an immigration to Biro-Bidjan of Jews not only from the East European countries but from Western Europe, from America, South Africa and even Palestine.

That is how things are in Biro-Bidjan [he writes]. The Jews have gone into the Siberian forests. If you ask them about Palestine, they laugh. The Palestine dream will long have receded into history when in Biro-Bidjan there will be motor cars, railways and steamers, huge factories belching forth their smoke, and the children of the free Jewish worker and peasant generation playing in lovely gardens. Biro-Bidjan will be a Jewish and Socialist land, one of the wonders of the Socialist constructive work of the Soviets.

It is amazing how easily people persuade themselves to see anywhere just whatever they wish to see. A scientific writer tells us that "it has been observed that there is a psychological condition favourable to autosuggestion." Colonel Wedgwood, in discussing Jewish colonisation in Russia, refers to one form of autosuggestion when he remarks that

it is the fashion—perhaps one should say that it is only good form in a patriotic Britisher—to attribute the worst actions, or at least the worst of motives to anything done by the Soviet Government. Indeed, I am prejudiced against the work of the Russians in settling the Jews [he adds] because I want the Jews in Palestine. But it is constructive work well done and deserves notice.

The reverse form of autosuggestion is found among the kind of people who see everything done or even contemplated by the Soviet Government as already completed to perfection. Someone who has been to Biro-Bidjan found that it had been raining terribly



for two years straight off, that the roads were impossible, that mosquitoes drove him mad, that the administrative machinery was disorganised, that there was no proper housing or food provision, and that settlers were going back discouraged to their old homes in the towns.

The majority of us ran back home [one settler told him]. Others who have a trade went to Chabarovsk and Vladivostock. Those who have a trade can find something to do in the Far East. But there were many of us who knew no trade and could not return. And nobody knows what to do with us. There is no place where to live. What should I do ? I stood in the road, knee-deep in mud ; rain was falling, and I cried like a child. My first conclusion [the writer says] was that the plan of colonisation in Biro-Bidjan was not a very successful one. Later, I came to the conclusion that the thing was much simpler—there just was no plan. The colonists are, indeed, paying bitterly for the fact that the colonisation of this wild country was conducted without study and without plan.

The glowing accounts of Biro-Bidjan presenting “a complete solution of the Jewish difficulties,” and the prophecies of Jews going there from Eastern and Western Europe, America, South Africa and Palestine are, of course, unrelated to reality. Though the disorganisation and the hardships are not the end of the experiment.

Nobody is to blame for the rains [one of the settlers in Biro-Bidjan said to the writer I have quoted]. The old men say we must expect such rains once every twenty years. How many places are there in Russia where droughts occur every twenty years. Does it mean that because of the drought everything is finished ? The drought ends and again the crops grow. The same in Biro-Bidjan. The rains will finish and everything will be

right again. It is simply our luck that we had to come here just when it had to rain for two years straight off.

The same with the mosquitoes.

Last year it was worse. As more people come here the mosquitoes grow fewer. It is very simple. The grass is cut down, the underbrush is cleared away, and the mosquitoes leave.

The Jews, as the colonisers of Biro-Bidjan, are also its carriers of civilisation [the writer concludes]. Not because they are Jews, but because they are sent by the Soviet Government, which knows that this country cannot be colonised without being developed on modern lines. With the new colonists come tractors, automobiles, excavators—partly Soviet, partly sent by friends and Jewish organisations in America. Building and agronomy also—and a new fuller life in general. Colonisation in Biro-Bidjan, particularly the Jewish colonisation, corresponds to the needs of the local inhabitants.

In the autumn of 1934, Dr. Joseph Rosen, the Director of the Agrojoint, an American Jewish organisation which has done a great deal of important work in promoting Jewish agricultural settlement in the Soviet countries, visited Biro-Bidjan, together with several other experts of the Agrojoint.

As it happens [he reported] we came to Biro-Bidjan during the local Indian summer season. The weather was exceptionally favourable, and the landscape beautiful. The rainy period usually lasting through July and August, when the country is frequently flooded, was over, and the mosquito and gnats pest season had almost ended. But even then, moving from one place to another at a little distance from the railroad, presented considerable difficulties, as there are as yet practically no roads in the country.

Almost one-third of the territory is occupied by chains of low hills and is therefore unsuitable for agricultural settlement [the report continues]. These hills, however,

as indicated by preliminary investigations, presumably abound in mineral resources, the exact value of which, quantitatively and qualitatively, still remains to be determined. The hills are mostly covered by forests containing very considerable quantities of valuable varieties of timber. The other two-thirds of the territory are mainly more or less marshy lowlands that could be made tillable only after extensive, and rather expensive drainage development. Several considerable drainage projects are being completed by the Government Land Department, with the use of modern machinery, excavators, graders and powerful caterpillar tractors. Judging by the results and condition of the crops on smaller tracts of similar, but slightly more favourably situated land now under cultivation, it may be reasonably expected that these projects, provided the land should be properly handled after the initial drainage, should develop successfully. A number of flatlands have been turned into fairly fertile fields. When the land is drained, valuable varieties of grasses and even legumes take a foothold, and the natural pastures and meadows gradually improve, making it possible to develop all kinds of livestock farming, including the improvement of the local breeds.

The industrial development of the country presents perhaps greater opportunities and fewer difficulties. The natural resources of raw materials, while not fully determined, are very extensive. The Government is planning to develop in the near future some heavy industries based on local ore and nearby coal deposits. The wood-working industries have a practically unlimited supply of raw material that can be moved along the numerous streams, rivulets and rivers. The supply of all kinds of building materials, including lumber, a great variety of stone, clay, and lime is found within the limits of this territory. Industrial enterprises, small and large, can be started in the settlements along the main trunk of the trans-Siberian Railway. There is a great demand for all kinds of manufactured articles produced from local, as well as some imported raw materials in the Far Eastern Territory of the U.S.S.R.

However, in spite of its comparative simplicity, the industrial development of the Region is unthinkable without an agricultural foundation providing a base of food supply at least for the local population, as it would be utterly impossible to depend in this respect on other farming sections located at a distance of hundreds and even thousands of kilometres.

The agricultural and industrial development of the Biro-Bidjan Region is quite feasible and possible [Dr. Rosen sums up], but it requires a tremendous investment, and presents incomparably more difficulties than any similar work in the Ukraine or Crimea. But granted that the Government will absorb the heavy initial expenses, and will complete through its own agencies the hardest tasks of road construction and land drainage and clearing, the opportunities for the compact settlement of large numbers of Jewish masses from Russia and from abroad are doubtlessly greater in Biro-Bidjan than in both these other districts.

We were particularly pleased to notice [Dr. Rosen adds] that none of the Government officials or representatives with whom we discussed various matters made the slightest attempt to try to minimise the difficulties connected with the settlement and development of the country; on the contrary, they invariably made it a point to emphasise these difficulties. Numerous conversations we have had with responsible central and local Government officials leave no doubt that the Soviet Government is determined to go ahead vigorously with the development of the project in spite of all difficulties. It is vitally interested in the settlement and development of the Far Eastern Territory, of which the Jewish Autonomous Region is only a small fractional part.

Dr. Rosen refers, of course, also to "the question of the war-cloud overhanging the Far East." "But with the present situation in Europe," he concludes, "it is not easy to say where the danger is greater." The people on the spot make nothing, in fact, of the

fears that Biro-Bidjan may become a cockpit in the event of trouble between Russia and Japan. Some even welcome the chance it would give them of serving their Russian Fatherland there. I confess I do not feel so easy about the danger. Yet nothing would ever induce me to write of the work that is being carried on there in the terms used by Mr. Israel Cohen, who is the General Secretary of the Zionist World Organisation. About the same time that Dr. Rosen and his fellow-experts were making their investigation in Biro-Bidjan, Mr. Cohen was writing :

Among all the projects that have been conceived at various times to establish an independent Jewish settlement none has been proclaimed so triumphantly and failed so disastrously as the scheme to create a so-called " Jewish Republic " in Biro-Bidjan. It was devised by the Soviet Government as a means to relieve at least a portion of the immeasurable distress that it had caused among the Jewish population by its economic policy, and likewise to show to the world that it was able to solve its own Jewish question in a manner that would confer happiness upon its Jews and renown upon itself. An elaborate bureaucratic apparatus was set up to organise the scheme ; expeditions and commissions galore were despatched to the distant land to investigate and report ; millions upon millions of roubles, partly lured from generous and credulous supporters in other countries, were squandered ; persuasive propagandists were sent to all parts of the globe to proclaim the growing wonder ; and now, after nearly six years of strenuous and Sisyphean effort, it is announced that the much-vaunted Republic is at length emerging from the swamps of Eastern Siberia.

The chequered history of the scheme is a tale of ambitious aspiration but ignoble disappointment, in which thousands of lives of trusting immigrants have been plunged into despair, and sentences of penal servitude and even of death have been imposed upon bungling administrators. But

the scheme is still persisted in with the dogged determination of the Bolsheviki State-builders, and with the money of unwitting sympathisers. It was a blunder from the very beginning, and it seems to be continued as a bluff.

In fairness to the Soviet Government, I must quote from Dr. Rosen's report the following passages :

The Soviet Government has already appropriated very substantial amounts for the development of Biro-Bidjan, and has accomplished a great deal of work. It must be frankly stated that whatever substantial work has been done in the Biro-Bidjan Region was accomplished by the various Government Departments directly, not by the Jewish organisations. In a spirit of friendly criticism it must be stated that the work of these organisations was not always properly planned nor expertly executed.

Mr. Cohen seems, indeed, to be in "the fashion," as Colonel Wedgwood described it, of "attributing the worst actions, or at least the worst of motives to anything done by the Soviet Government." Like Colonel Wedgwood he is "prejudiced against the work of the Russians in settling the Jews because he wants the Jews in Palestine." But Colonel Wedgwood found the work in Biro-Bidjan "constructive work well done." So much depends on your point of view. In all things. I see that Mr. Stephen Gwynn, writing of Sir Roger Casement, proud though he is of the answer the Irish prisoners of war gave him, shows that the thing that he asked of them was only what Masaryk asked of the captured Czechs. Czechoslovakia's heroes, Masaryk's heroes, are soldiers who did what Casement wanted the Irish soldiers to do. And who in Europe does not respect Masaryk and Masaryk's country?

"History is unjust to the defeated," writes Stefan Zweig in *Erasmus*. Let us go back to Colonel Wedg-

wood. He is, as it happens, a liberal-minded man, and Jews and many others fighting against odds have found him a doughty champion of liberty and justice. Yet to the *Catholic Herald* he is "one of the most narrow bigots in the House of Commons. His anti-Catholic diatribes are notorious," it continues. "Wedgwood, talking of liberty and justice, is guilty of flat blasphemy. He does not understand the very rudiments of liberty." It is an old story. Jews judge Titus, for instance, solely by his destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem. What else could they do? In our gratitude to Balfour, we forget that to Ireland he is "Bloody Balfour," and that even to so pro-Zionist a non-Jewish Irish American as the Rev. John Haynes Holmes, the Balfour Declaration and political Zionism are suspect precisely because "Balfour, persecutor of the Irish" is associated with them. We do the same for Cromwell, because he readmitted Jews to England, and overlook the Irish "Curse of Cromwell." For another thing, who in these days of propaganda about the immense strides of industrialisation and urbanisation in Russia under the Soviet regime realises that before the war, in 1914, as Michael Farbman reminds us,

While the United States possessed over three times as many industrial workers as Russia, the number of workers in the biggest factories (factories employing over 1,000 hands) was nearly equal in the two countries. In 1914 there were 1,255,000 such workers in America, while in Russia there were 1,300,000 exclusive of the miners. There were three times as many gigantic factories (those employing over 5,000 workers) in Russia as there were in Germany. In Petrograd alone there were more such factories than in the whole of Germany. Already the census of 1897

established the fact that 20 million peasants had left the land to take up work in towns or to become artisans.

Kropotkin had already drawn our attention to it. In *Conquest of Bread* he wrote:

At the time of the abolition of serfdom in 1861, Russia had hardly any factories. Everything needed in the way of machines, rails, railway engines, dress materials, came from the West. Twenty years later she possessed 85,000 workers, and now nearly all the steel in use in Russia, three-quarters of the iron, two-thirds of the coal, all railway engines, railway-carriages, rails, nearly all steamers, are made in Russia.

Articles like Mr. Cohen's are nevertheless a necessary counterpoise, in a way, to the exaggerated hopefulness of Soviet partisans, who refuse to see any spots on the sun, just as these same Soviet partisans provide at times a very useful corrective to exaggerated Zionist hopes. The Icos, which is the Organisation for Jewish Colonisation in the U.S.S.R., publishes a magazine in London called *New Life*, whose March 1936 issue speaks ecstatically of the great strides that have taken place in the upbuilding of Biro-Bidjan. At exactly the same time as this propaganda magazine appeared, the *Emes*, the Yiddish Communist daily in Moscow, published an article by Mr. A. Chatzkievitch, the Secretary of the Nationalities Council of the Central Executive Committee of the R.S.F.S.R., who pointed out that at present the Jewish population of Biro-Bidjan is only 21 per cent of the total population, and in the past year the Jewish population increased only 3 per cent.

If the settlement of Jews in the Region proceeds at this rate, it will never become an Autonomous Jewish Republic,



with a Jewish majority [he declared]. The settlement of Jews in Biro-Bidjan under the existing conditions in Russia is not easy [he continued], and obviously, it is not enough to deliver a few speeches, and expect people who are well-placed in other parts of the Soviet Union to go and move into Biro-Bidjan, unless Biro-Bidjan can offer them something better. One of the most serious obstacles [he found] is the slow rate at which housing accommodation is being provided in Biro-Bidjan.

His Nationalities Council has

carefully considered a report about the progress of building work in Biro-Bidjan, and has come to the conclusion that it is far from satisfactory, and it has decided to consider seriously the need of reorganising the Comzet (Government Commission for Jewish Settlement) and the Ozet (Society for Settling Jews in the Soviet Union).

But meanwhile, the settlement work in Biro-Bidjan goes on. In the city of Biro-Bidjan alone, there is now a population of about 13,000, and in the five districts of the Region there are several thousands of agricultural settlers. During 1936, Mr. Dimantstein, the President of the Jewish Settlement Organisation in the Soviet Union, states, 10,000 new Jewish settlers will be settled in the Biro-Bidjan Region. Biro-Bidjan has vast possibilities, Mr. Dimantstein says. It has enormous natural resources. It is the only place in the Soviet Union that has green marble deposits, it has huge ore deposits and will develop an important metallurgical industry. Biro-Bidjan is also rich in timber and there are millions of hectares of virgin soil which have to be brought under cultivation.

I am no Communist, to grow enthusiastic about Soviet plans because they are sponsored by the Soviet, but wherever there is soil that can be utilised and

built upon, natural resources and an ordinarily industrious population, it is possible to produce wealth and happiness. I found mosquitoes and bad roads in Palestine, just as they have been found in Biro-Bidjan ; and the Rev. John Haynes Holmes, a very pro-Zionist clergyman, writes in his book about Palestine that he happened to arrive in Palestine when the floods had isolated the colonies and made it impossible to get about. Some of the places, he says, looked like the flooded Mississippi Valley. And nothing can exceed in dismal forsakenness the village of Afulah, in Palestine, when I saw it in the late autumn of 1934, the town that was started ten years before, in the early summer of 1924, by the American Zion Commonwealth to become the key city of the Valley of Jezreel.

Biro-Bidjan may yet become an important place of Jewish settlement. But for the present, the Soviet Government looks upon it as a means of concentrating a part of the Jewish population already in the Soviet Union into a Jewish administrative unit of their own. Except for skilled building workers, engineers and others needed for the upbuilding of Biro-Bidjan whom it cannot obtain in sufficient numbers in the Soviet Union, there is little opportunity there now for the surplus Jewish populations of Germany, Poland and other countries, even those of them who accept the Soviet ideology. To say nothing of those who have no wish to live in a Soviet land.

The magazine *New Life*, published in London in March by the Organisation for Jewish Colonisation in the U.S.S.R., joyfully proclaims that during 1936 the Soviet authorities will admit 1,000 Jewish families from Poland and other East European countries as

settlers in Biro-Bidjan. A similar announcement has been made simultaneously in New York by the American Committee for the Settlement of Jews in Biro-Bidjan, which is the organisation, it seems, which made this arrangement with the Soviet authorities (the Comzet). The agreement was signed in September 1935, it is explained, and the Committee has undertaken to raise a fund out of which it will pay the Soviet Government 200 dollars for each non-Russian Jewish family settled in Biro-Bidjan. An official announcement issued in Moscow at the end of February, states that during 1935 there were 8,347 new settlers in Biro-Bidjan, all of them coming from various parts of the Soviet Union, and that during 1936 it is intended to settle 10,000 people, half of whom will be recruited abroad, principally in Poland. Five thousand people are presumably identical with 1,000 families, calculating an average of three children per family. But emphasis is still laid on the need of selecting those elements who are needed for the economy of Biro-Bidjan, builders, technical experts, highly skilled workers and organisers. And there does not seem to be any departure from the principle laid down by Mr. Dimantstein, who is the head of the Comzet, the Government organisation for Jewish settlement that

the building of Biro-Bidjan is undertaken not for the Jewish immigrants from abroad, but for the working-class Jews of the Soviet Union. Jewish immigrants from abroad will be admitted only to such an extent as they are necessary as skilled workers to hasten the process of building Biro-Bidjan.

It has just been re-emphasised (April 25, 1936) by the Secretary of the White Russian Ozet (Jewish

Settlement Society). "The transmigration of Jews from abroad to Biro-Bidjan is for the purpose of recruiting workers of certain professions which the region needs and which are not sufficiently represented among the Jewish workers of the Soviet Union."

Also, we have heard before about this admission of Jewish families from abroad. At the beginning of 1932, just over four years ago, Mr. William Zukerman was writing :

The change which has so revolutionised the Biro-Bidjan plan was the decision of the Soviet Government to open the door of Biro-Bidjan to Jewish workers outside the Soviet Union. This decision was adopted last summer (the summer of 1931). The first experiment in recruiting foreign Jewish workers was completed last autumn (1931) in the small Baltic state of Lithuania, which has a population of only about 200,000 Jews. Within a period of six weeks twelve hundred Jewish families applied to the Soviet Government to be sent to Biro-Bidjan, out of whom 340 were selected as fit for immigration, and were sent to Biro-Bidjan. Six hundred more applicants from Belgium and thousands of other prospective candidates from practically every country in Europe had to be deferred until next spring, when foreign recruiting will be resumed. In a recent speech delivered at Minsk, M. Merezhin, who was then secretary of the Comzet (the Government Department for Settling Jews on the Land), stated that the Soviet Government is prepared to admit 12,000 Jews from other lands for settlement in Biro-Bidjan during 1932. This number does not include Jews from Poland, where enlistment has not yet been decided upon. Should a campaign similar to that in Lithuania be started in Poland, there will doubtless be found ten times 12,000 Jews ready to emigrate from there.

And in his enthusiasm, Mr. Zukerman already saw these settlers "founding a home in the Taigas of

Siberia not only for themselves, but for millions of their people who are in a worse condition now than their parents ever were under the Czars half a century ago." Now, four years later, there is talk of admitting a thousand Jewish families from abroad.

But it is a big enough task to create a successful Jewish unit in Biro-Bidjan for the existing Jewish population of the Soviet Union. Difficulties are not swept away as quickly as in the imaginations of enthusiasts, Zionists, Sovietists, or whatever else they may be, and the building up of Biro-Bidjan will not be achieved overnight. But there are over two and a half million Jews in the Soviet Union, and if their problem will be solved by Biro-Bidjan and the other measures that are being taken by the Soviet Government, I would to God that one could look forward to such a solution of the problem of the millions of Jewish population in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Roumania, to say nothing of that of the Jews of Germany and Austria, so that there should be no need for them to seek other outlets than those in their native countries! Millions of Irishmen driven from home by famine have made good in America and elsewhere, and are contented and loyal in their new lands, but one may say—would there had never been famine and distress to drive them from their homes! I am too fond of my own home, of the familiar faces and the familiar tongue and usages to wish for any unnecessary uprooting of anyone. Some adventurous roving spirits there always will be, who will refuse to stay safely at home, just as Buckle estimated that there will always be in any society a certain fixed proportion of murderers and suicides. "In a given

state of society a certain number must put an end to their own life. This is the general law." But the bulk of the people are neither murderers nor suicides, nor restless wanderers. And those of them who are forcibly uprooted and compelled to wander, seek as quickly as possible to become rooted in the new soil. They want to belong, not to feel alien, out of place.

Zionists, angered by the Soviet opposition to their movement, which is treated as illegal by the Soviet Government, say that the Biro-Bidjan scheme has been launched in rivalry to Zionism. One Zionist Labour paper quotes Kalinin, the President of the Soviet Union, on Biro-Bidjan—"Personally, I believe that in about ten years' time Biro-Bidjan will be the cultural centre of the Jewish masses. The present pioneers in mastering this new region will create a strong and healthy generation"—and says, "Kalinin's remarks sound like a Zionist tract; unfortunately, however, nationalist passions eminently praiseworthy and ideologically correct when directed towards the wastes of Biro-Bidjan become criminal heresy in the case of Palestine."

But

one must stress again [it proceeds] that though there is anti-Zionism, there is no antisemitism in Russia. In its creation of a new world, the Soviet has approached the question of racial prejudice as fundamentally as it has other major problems.

The Jews have lived for thousands of years in Russia [Kalinin has said, speaking of the Palestine movement]. Have they then no place in Russia that they should look for a Fatherland elsewhere? I consider that it would be absolutely inadmissible from the point of view of the

Soviet régime that the Jewish toiling masses should desert us in search of happiness elsewhere.

That is the right tone. In the old Czarist days, when the best and noblest spirits in Russia were struggling for freedom and democracy, there was issued a manifesto signed by over 200 Senators, members of Parliament, Professors, Academicians, and the greatest writers of Russia, which read in part :

Russians, the Russian Jew has no other fatherland than Russia, and nothing is dearer to a man than the soil on which he is born. The welfare and power of Russia are inseparably bound up with the welfare and liberties of all the nationalities that constitute the whole Empire. The disappearance of all kinds of persecution of the Jews and their complete emancipation, so as to be our equals in all rights of citizenship, will form one of the conditions of a really constructive Imperial policy.

It is common humanity, and one of the prime conditions of a really constructive policy of any country, Imperial or Soviet or anything else. I have never tired of emphasising that forms are only the groundwork of life. In 1920, when Russia was a place of mystery, hidden from the world, and all sorts of rumours were in circulation about what was going on there, I wrote in *Voices* : " The ground of life in Russia has been changed. That is all. It has become more firm, perhaps. The marshes have been drained. But the life built up on it is still the same life." Economic justice, administrative honesty, liberty of thought and expression are essential things. Without them, life is thwarted, great numbers of people get no chance of living. But when these things have all been granted, life only then begins, and under the

best of conditions, "we shall, to the end of time, find the majority somewhat unintelligent, a little inclined to be idle, and occasionally, on Saturday nights, drunk," we shall find some people naturally happy, and some temperamentally miserable or even vicious. "For men are not guilty of crimes for necessities only," as Aristotle said. "Nature has her aberrations under any system." And "in a given state of society, a certain number must put an end to their own life. That is the general law."

So Kalinin's principle that the Jews of Russia have their place in Russia, and should seek no Fatherland elsewhere is acceptable and welcome to me, and I think to the great majority of Jews and of thinking human beings all over the world, whatever they may think of Soviet methods otherwise, just as the manifesto of the Russian Liberal politicians, academicians and writers in Czarist days declaring that the Russian Jew has no other fatherland than Russia was acceptable and right.

At the time of the first Russian Revolution in 1917, Cyrus Sulzberger wrote in the *American Hebrew* :

A legally publicly secured home in Russia being secured, will there still be the same insistence on such a home in Palestine? On the part of those who are Zionists because of a desire for a separate national existence there will of course be no change, but as to those who espoused the cause, as Herzl originally did, for the sake of the oppressed Jews of Russia, the situation will be altered.

Michael Farbman, who was one of the leading authorities on revolutionary Russia, wrote in one of his last books :

The Russian Revolution confirms the old opinion that



a Revolution is, after all, only evolution speeded up, a movement towards progress which though undoubtedly marred by its inevitable waste and destruction never fails to yield substantial gains. The War and the Revolution have brought untold miseries on Russia, and decades will pass before all the wounds are healed. But the unprecedented psychological and mental shaking-up that the country has undergone, and the newly awakened instinct for life and action probably outweigh all the destructive consequences of the turmoil.

Ten years after he wrote this, in 1931, the "Magen" Association to Assist the Persecuted Zionists in Russia, published an appeal to the Zionist Congress, in which it said :

The fighters for the Zionist Renaissance suffer and die in Soviet Russia. There are still small Zionist cells that continue their work, but the majority of the Russian Zionists of all trends languish in the "Politisolators." There is not a single town or township in the Ukraine or White Russia that has not its representatives in exile or prison.

Mr. Leonard Montefiore, speaking officially as President at one of the meetings of the Anglo-Jewish Association, a couple of years back, referred to a notice in the morning papers of that day

of what is described by one of them as a drastic change in the Soviet Government's attitude towards religion. Having previously stated there was no persecution of religion in Russia, the heads of the Soviet Government now apparently admit there has been such a persecution but that it has been a mistake and by strengthening religious faith has failed in its object. It is not merely Judaism that is menaced, but every kind of religion.

I have not heard that there has yet been a cessation

of the persecution in Russia of Zionism of Hebrew

culture and of the Jewish religion, as of all other religions (except Leninism—I saw it in action in the film, “The Three Songs of Lenin,” and “the masses had been longing instinctively for such a Messianic promise as Lenin held out to them,” said Farbman). And I still am a liberal, to whom suppression of conscience and coercion and the stifling of free thought and speech is savagery, no matter what god is invoked. Indeed,

no barbarian [said Bagehot] can bear to see one of his nation deviate from the customs and usages of their tribe. All the tribe would expect a punishment from the gods. Guilt to us is an individual taint. But in early ages the act of one member of the tribe is conceived to make all the tribe impious, to offend its peculiar god, to expose all the tribe to penalties from heaven. If the State is conceived thus, toleration becomes wicked.

Yet Rabbi Mase, who was Chief Rabbi of Moscow, once said in the spirit of Anatole France, who told us that absolute government makes Republicans,—“Judaism will not die in Russia. The Chedar (Hebrew school) trained Apikorsim (atheists); the persecution of the chedar will accomplish the reverse.” A religion that cannot survive proscription and persecution is a poor sort of religion, and has outlived its day. It would have died of inertia anyway. I have faith in the future of Judaism in Russia. And when people object that Jews are sent to a place like Siberia where there are no Jewish traditions, I am not very much impressed. Zionists sometimes say sneeringly that it is “out of Zion shall come forth the Law, and the word of God from Jerusalem,” not from Biro-Bidjan. But the word of God has come from many other places, not

only from Jerusalem. It has come from wherever there have been Godly men. And the cities of Maimonides, of Rashi, of the Vilna Gaon, or of the Besht, to speak of only a few, and of only a few of the Jews among them, are as holy as Jerusalem. Why cannot the word of God come from Biro-Bidjan, as from anywhere else ? "Is there really so great a difference, in essence, between a Hosanna in Jerusalem and an Ave in Rome ?" asked Rabbi Joel Blau.

Is there a real difference—again I say: *in essence*—between Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hillel, Jesus, in Jerusalem ; and Socrates, Plato, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Seneca, in Athens and Rome ? Are not the same spiritual and intellectual forces at work in all these great minds ?

Judaism has always been desirous, indeed, eagerly anxious, that all mankind should accept the glorious spiritual and ethical truths which God in his wisdom saw fit to reveal to Israel [Rabbi Dr. Drachman says], but it has not understood this in terms of actual enrolment in the ranks of its adherents and acceptance of the specifically Jewish duties. . . . Judaism does not hold that the rest of mankind must be brought into the Synagogue in order to save them from a dreadful fate. The Talmud says distinctly that "The just of all nations of the world will have a portion in the world to come."

And Jews bring Jewish traditions with them, in so far as they are Jewish and the traditions of Judaism, and not of the old soil. They did not find them ready-made and waiting for them in England or America or South Africa. Even Jerusalem was once a heathen Jebusite city, that Israelites avoided because it was "the city of a stranger," and it was only King David who took it from the Jebusites and made it Israelitish, Zion. The Soviet complaint is rather that the Jews

whom they bring to the new places continue to observe their Jewish religion as they did in the Pale. Give a people their economic foothold, and they will surely find their soul.

Dr. Chaim Jitlovsky, the theoretician of the Jewish Socialist movement, claims that the setting up of Biro-Bidjan is pure Jewish nationalism.

Read Kalinin's speeches explaining the motives that induced the Workers' and Peasants' Government to take this step and it becomes clear that it was not the social-economic aspect of the Jewish question, but the national aspect that played the most important part. Jews, as workers and peasants, have room enough in Greater Russia, Ukraine, White Russia, Crimea, and where not in that sixth part of the globe that calls itself the Soviet Union. But for Jews as Jews there is Biro-Bidjan. I am not going to deal now with the prospects of Biro-Bidjan as a Jewish Republic. I am only concerned here with the principle.

Dr. Jacob Lestchinsky, writing in the Labour Zionist organ, the *Jewish Frontier*, takes the same view. He quotes Kalinin :

Under the fundamentals of Soviet policy every nation will build the frame of a state within a definite territory. The rise of a national sentiment and the workers' activity in every nationality have intensified the tempo of the economic and cultural upbuilding within the limits of the national autonomous unit. The Jews have never had these conditions, and that places them in a somewhat different position from other nationalities. The creation of a Jewish autonomous sector will give a sound foundation to the Jewish nation. By it the Jewish population will become unified and will acquire all the traits of a nation. The Jewish autonomous sector opens wide horizons for the blossoming of Jewish literature in the future. I think that ten years hence Biro-Bidjan will be the main cultural

centre of the Jewish working masses. The establishment of the Jewish autonomous sector will enable the concentration of large Jewish masses in the form of a state unit. It will raise to a higher level the realisation of the cultural aspirations of these masses, and it will lay a healthy foundation for the economic and cultural development of the Jewish nation. I think that in ten years Biro-Bidjan will be the most important and perhaps the only guardian of Jewish socialist culture. Moscow, for instance, cannot preserve national diversities. What specific Jewish interests will a Jewish worker have after ten years in Moscow? Practically none. But Biro-Bidjan, together with a great socialist upbuilding, will have a real *Jewish* socialist culture. All those who appreciate it must give a hand to this undertaking and link themselves with Biro-Bidjan. I think that Jews will preserve their own characteristics in this Jewish sector much longer than in any other place. The establishment of the sector puts the Jewish nation on its feet.

Of course, Biro-Bidjan is not the first attempt made by the Soviet authorities to set up a Jewish Republic. Ten or twelve years ago there was a lot of talk about a Jewish Republic that was to be created in the Crimea. And M. Kalinin, the "old man" of the Soviet regime, the titular President of the Soviet Union, is as a rule very optimistic about these things. When the first Jewish Colonisation Conference met in Moscow in 1926 he spoke just as confidently about the Jewish Republic that was then soon to be proclaimed in the Crimea. Louis Fischer, writing at that time, spoke of the intention of the Soviet Government to

set up an autonomous Jewish territory which shall include all Northern Crimea and large parts of the adjoining Ukrainian gubernies. The tenth anniversary of the Communist revolution which will be celebrated in November

1927, may see the proclamation of a Jewish regional State in Russia.

It has not all ended in nothing, for to-day there are a number of interesting self-governing Jewish settlements in the Ukraine and the Crimea, but ten years have passed, and the talk is now of a Jewish regional State in Biro-Bidjan.

But Dr. Lestchinsky is concerned with the principle of what Kalinin says :

It is a different problem to ask whether Biro-Bidjan is the suitable country, whether it is possible under Soviet conditions to arouse national enthusiasm and readiness for sacrifice without which no great creation is feasible. All these are practical problems with which I do not now deal. But the principle—the method—is correct, and it shows that all who think about the fate of Jews as a *nation* will find, perhaps against their will, only one way out : Territorialism, concentration in one land—"Zionism."

It may be. Much depends on how you define words and motives. Leo Kenig, for instance, writes :

In present-day Russia, where political Zionism is illegal, there is more original Zionist work being done than by Zionists anywhere outside Palestine. I mean the productivisation of the Jewish masses through agriculture, and in the factories. Even the songs of the Jewish Soviet poets have more genuine Zionism in them than the cultured and aesthetic languishings of a great many modern Hebrew poets even in Palestine.

And I. M. Neuman, speaking of the Chalutzim, the workers training in Poland to go out as pioneers to Palestine, says :

It is true the Chalutzim are Zionists. Their ultimate goal is Palestine, their language is Hebrew. But it is a

moot question whether they have not more in common with the Jewish farm labourer of Argentine or Russia than with the landlord of Tel Aviv. Their real ideal is labour, their real religion, labour.

That is all very well. But when I went to Palestine not long ago, I found a Chaluz weeping on board the ship just before we disembarked. He explained to me that he came from a small town in Lithuania. There were four brothers, and no sisters. He was going to live in Palestine, in a communal settlement. Another brother was training in a Chaluz farm, and would join him. The other two brothers were anti-Zionists, were Communists, and were getting ready to go to Biro-Bidjan. And the parents were old, and would stay where they were, alone. Is there no principle, no ideal other than labour involved here ?

Avram Yarmolinsky writes :

The Bolsheviks doubt the reality of a Jewish nation on a world-wide scale, but they believe that the portion of the race that lives within the borders of the Union may achieve the status of a national entity with a territorial basis. Such a consolidation they believe to be useful to the Cause and therefore desirable. The Jewish Soviet Republic envisaged by the orthodox Communists differs fundamentally from Herzl's polity in Zion, as well as from the Territorialists' homeland. It is not intended to furnish the Jewish people throughout the world with the political life that it has lacked for so long. Nor is it intended to become the seat of the putative civilisation of the race. It contributes little to the solution of the Jewish problem on a world scale, but it would afford Russian Jewry a basis for a full national life.

One may doubt whether the Soviet Union will seek to concentrate its Jewish population into a Soviet Palestine, or a Goshen, according to how you look

at it. After all, it straddles across a sixth of the earth's surface. And Lenin has said :

Look at the map of the Soviet Republic. To the north of Vologda, to the south-west of Rostov-on-the-Don and of Saratov, the south of Urenburg and of Omsk and to the north of Tomsk, there are immense territories, room for a dozen big civilised States. And all these lands are semi-wild and really wild. And what about the remote countryside even in the heart of Russia? What about villages lying miles away from railways, away from material connection with civilisation, capitalism, industries and towns?

Long before there was a Soviet régime in Russia, before anyone foresaw even the Kerensky revolution, in the early days of the War, when Russia was still Czarist, Zangwill was writing :

In Siberia (where this Biro-Bidjan is situated) only ten millions of people eke out a livelihood, and a Continent, half as large again as the United States has been left almost in primeval forest. Is there any reason why the Jews instead of being cooped up in stinking poverty in the towns of the Pale should not be invited to carve out a province with the ploughshare from these vast neglected territories?

If ever Biro-Bidjan becomes what the Biro-Bidjanist enthusiasts say it will, Zangwill should be proclaimed its prophet.

Russia is a vast country, extending over a third of Europe and a third of Asia. It may quite possibly provide opportunities for the ultimate immigration of dispossessed Jews from other countries, who wish to make their home under Soviet rule. It may be that Biro-Bidjan, as it develops, will find room for them. But for me it is enough at present that Russia, "Darkest



Russia," which not long ago plagued the world with its Jewish migration problem, whose Czar thanked God for their departure and exclaimed "May they continue to emigrate," and whose treatment of the Jews made Baron de Hirsch start his movement to transplant them to the Argentine, and declare, "If my energies or my fortune could accomplish it, believe me, the whole Jewish population of Russia would be taken out of the country to-morrow," no longer forces Jewish emigrants to go wandering across the world to find new homes, but provides homes for them in their native land.

## CHAPTER VII

### WHERE CAN THEY GO ?

TO-DAY, Germany, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Roumania are the countries that find it impossible or are unwilling to accommodate all their present Jewish populations. And it is for some of these that it is necessary now to find an outlet where they can obtain an economic foothold. "The Russian Jew has grit, industry and sobriety and is eager for work. They give me the greatest hope." That is what Baron de Hirsch said, backed by his experience of them in his Argentine Jewish colonisation work. And the Jews of Poland, Latvia, Lithuania and of part of Roumania are the same Jews who in Baron de Hirsch's day were Russian Jews, because the territories on which they are native were part of the old Russian Empire.

The Jewish Colonisation Association, popularly known as the Ica, which Baron de Hirsch founded with a capital of £8,000,000 contributed all by himself, partly during his lifetime and partly by bequest, has, apart from its many other activities, built up practically the whole of the great Jewish life of the Argentine, with its important agricultural colonies, which have repeatedly been praised by the Governmental authorities as valuable contributions to the economic life of the country.

The Ica colonies are all over the world [Sir Osmond d'Avigdor Goldsmid, now President of the Association, said recently]. In the Argentine, in Brazil, the United States, Canada, Palestine and Eastern Europe hundreds of thousands of Jews live as a result of its work by cultivating the soil. Former mistakes and lack of adaptation are no longer troubling them. All they desire at present is to continue their work on the land. There are 30,000 Jews on the lands of the Ica in the Argentine and room for as many more. Our Association possesses vast territories overseas which it is eager to settle. It is necessary, however, that the various Governments should facilitate our tasks and should remove the barriers which are everywhere erected against immigration.

The Ica also administers the important Rothschild colonies in Palestine, where, Sir Osmond has said, it has "introduced various improvements. It had brought the first steam plough into the country and had led the way in tobacco growing."

In Canada, for instance, Jewish colonisation dates back to 1882, when the Mansion House Committee of London made an attempt to establish a colony near Moosomin in the Canadian North West. After receipt of the first contribution of Twenty Thousand Dollars from Baron de Hirsch in 1890, the Young Men's Hebrew Benevolent Society—which was then the only Jewish philanthropic organisation in Canada—had been urged by a number of immigrants to assist them to go on the land, but it was not until 1891 that any progress was made.

The Government of Canada [writes Mr. Belkin in the *Canadian Jewish Chronicle*] was well disposed towards the idea of Jewish land settlement and promised the Young Men's Hebrew Benevolent Society every possible assistance. At that time, an official of the Manitoba Government

associated with the High Commissioner's Office in London approached Baron de Hirsch with a view to having him transfer his colonisation activities from Argentine to the Province of Manitoba. A group of Jewish farmers had already settled at Oxbow, Saskatchewan. On April 27 1892, twenty-seven heads of families were sent from Montreal. The settlers reached Oxbow on May 2, and a few days later they laid the foundation of the oldest Jewish colony in Canada and named it Hirsch in honour of Baron de Hirsch. During the years 1893 and 1894, further contributions were received for colonisation purposes. In 1901, the Jewish Colonisation Association established a Colony north of Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan, which is now known as the Lipton Colony.

The years 1907-1914 brought a large influx of Jewish immigrants to Canada which was mainly due to the Russian pogroms of 1905. The reception and maintenance of immigrants continued under the auspices of the Baron de Hirsch Institute, the funds being supplied by the Jewish Colonisation Association.

In 1906, the following Colonies were founded: Sonnenfeld and Edenbridge in Saskatchewan, Rumsey in Alberta and Ste. Sophie in Quebec. The Sonnenfeld Colony was established by former pupils of the Jewish Colonisation Association Agricultural School at Slobodka Lesna, Galicia. The other Colonies were founded by groups of Jewish immigrants who settled on the land of their own accord. A number of other groups of Jewish farmers sprang up throughout Canada. The economic depression which followed immediately after the War adversely affected the farming communities for some time. As a result of the visits made to Canada by Mr. Edouard Oungre, Associate General Manager of the Jewish Colonisation Association in 1921 and 1923, the work in the Colonies was further developed. In 1926, the Association launched a new colonisation plan in Canada. Large tracts of land were purchased in the districts of the Sonnenfeld and Hirsch Colonies. Immigrant families were brought in from Poland and established on farms fully improved with buildings,

fences and wells. The settlers were also furnished with a sufficient number of horses, cows and necessary machinery. They were assisted with loans for the purchase of seed and fodder and were helped to buy provisions until the next harvest. During the years 1907-30, the Committee advanced 2,529 loans, the total of which runs into enormous figures. The Association has also helped the farmers to erect communal buildings and has subventioned the Hebrew and religious education of their children.

In praising the work of the Association in Canada [Mr. Belkin emphasises] credit should be given to the pioneer spirit which imbued the Jewish settlers during their early struggles to establish themselves. The story of their lives is one of great sacrifice and persistence against adverse conditions. Jewish farmers have proved to be of good mettle and have contributed to the opening of large uncultivated areas and their conversion into fertile lands. The district in which the Edenbridge Colony is now situated was a wilderness covered with woods and marshes before the advent of the Jewish farmer. There are nearly 7,300 acres under cultivation in this Colony. Jews have proved that they can make good farmers and it is gratifying to see a second generation following in the footsteps of their fathers. When Baron de Hirsch began his great colonisation work, he said: "I shall try to make for them (Jewish immigrants) a new home in different lands where as free farmers on their own soil they can make themselves useful to the country." This great ideal of the Baron has been achieved in Canada as well as in many other lands. The Jewish farming communities in Canada are a living monument to Baron de Hirsch. They will perpetuate the idea of productive work and economic independence for the Jewish masses which was so dear to the heart of the great benefactor. Jews the world over have honoured the memory of Baron de Hirsch by naming colonies, villages, schools and institutions after him, but Maurice de Hirsch needs no monuments of brick and stone. Tens of thousands of self-reliant Jews under free skies and hundreds of acres of fruitful soil

cultivated by Jewish labour are a living memorial to his name.

A few years ago, when Baron de Hirsch's centenary was being celebrated, Dr. Weinstein, a prominent Jewish citizen of Chile, who described himself as "A Nephew of Baron de Hirsch," explained why he had taken on the Presidency of the Jewish Immigrant Aid Society of Chile.

Forty years ago [he wrote] my father became a man, thanks to Baron de Hirsch. My father succeeded admirably, and when he died he left behind him a large family of respected citizens of Chile. What would have happened to me if Baron de Hirsch had not helped my parents to leave Russia? I want to pay back my debt. It is my duty to help others to escape misery and persecution and settle in our country. In that way I gratefully repay the debt contracted as a nephew of Baron de Hirsch.

"What would have happened to me if Baron de Hirsch had not helped my parents to leave Russia?" This is what is so terrible about the present condition not only of Jews, but of all people who are crushed by the poverty-stricken, congested state of their native countries, that they cannot develop, they cannot expand, they cannot become what they might with greater freedom and opportunity. They are forced to be slum-people, instead of respected citizens. Senator Gogarty, an Irish Senator, recently declared :

Some hundreds of thousands of the Irish people do not like their country because it is not Brooklyn, Boston or Philadelphia. They consider it a prison because they are no longer able to emigrate into a country with the highest standards of living in the world.

To come back to the Ica and the Argentine, it is worth noting that Mr. Leib Jaffe, the Director of the

Palestine Foundation Fund (the Keren Hayesod) writing of a visit that he paid to the Argentine to collect funds for the building up of Palestine, says that he found the two Jewish communities, in Palestine and the Argentine, grown up during the same period, almost equal in numbers, and the Jewish people in the Argentine "faithful and devoted to Judaism" and responsive to his appeal for help for Palestine. "Jews plough the wide prairies and pampas of Argentina," he writes, "so that the fields of Palestine may flourish. In remote villages women bring their trinkets."

While Baron de Hirsch was concentrating on settling Jews in South America, and the Zionists, led by Dr. Herzl, were trying to obtain favourable conditions for settling them in Palestine and were building up the Organisation which afterwards secured the Balfour Declaration and is now recognised by the British Government and the League of Nations as the Jewish Agency for Palestine, Jews were pouring into the United States of America, attracted not by the romantic Jewish fervour of the Palestine enthusiasts, nor by the practical constructive philanthropy of Baron de Hirsch, but by the economic opportunities of a land in the making. And several Jewish agencies of American Jews began to consider the advisability of directing the immigrants to the West and settling them there as farmers. One of these agencies, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society of America, asked one of its representatives, Mr. Julius Goldman, to investigate the possibilities. In 1882, Mr. Goldman presented his report to the Society. He said that he had made a tour of investigation in the West, to see

whether he could find a suitable tract of land for colonisation purposes. He had found several, he declared. There were the lands on the Winona and St. Peter's Branch of the Chicago and North-western Railroad.

The lands are situated [he said] in Cottonwood, Brown, Redwood, Lyon, Lincoln, Yellow Medicine and Lacqui-Parle Counties, Minnesota; and in Grant, Deuel, Hamlin and Coddington Counties, Dakota. There can be no doubt that some of the finest lands in the country are to be found in these countries, and if a careful selection should be made fine contiguous tracts of land might be obtained. The schedule price of the lands varies between three dollars and 5.50 dollars. Mr. Charles E. Simmons, the general land agent of this railroad, informed me that if the Society should conclude to purchase large tracts of these lands for cash a considerable discount from schedule prices would be allowed.

There was in particular, a tract of land of about 250,000 acres situated in the South-western part of Minnesota.

The soil [Mr. Goldman reported] appears to be as rich and fertile as any which I have seen. It is well-watered and situated between three railroads. The prices vary from three to seven dollars per acre, and I believe no better locality could be found for placing a colony. Satisfactory arrangements could doubtless be made with the railroad company for the purchase of a sufficient quantity to meet our needs.

Mr. Goldman had also enquired into the possibilities of obtaining Government lands for settlement. But there was a very serious difficulty there.

For individual settlers [he said] there is an opportunity to obtain, in many parts of the Union, the finest quality



of land free of charge, excepting the fees of the Land Office, which amount to about fourteen dollars for every 160 acres. The difficulty would be to secure a sufficient body of land, because under the laws of the United States only actual settlers can acquire a claim.

But there was this tract of land available of about 250,000 acres, with soil as rich and fertile as any Mr. Goldman had seen, well-watered and between three railroads, situated so that "no better locality could be found for placing a colony," the prices varying from three to seven dollars per acre. And this was only one of several suitable tracts. That was in 1882, the same year that the Rothschild colonics, now administered by the Ica, were started in Palestine, and these extend at present to an area of over 450,000 dunam, which is less than half the area of the Minnesota tract (250,000 acres equals about 1,100,000 dunam.) The Jewish National Fund owns in Palestine about 200,000 dunam, and all the land in Palestine now in Jewish possession, public and private together is just under the area of this one Minnesota tract, for it hardly exceeds, all told 1,000,000 dunam. Despite the fact that there has been an increase in the income of the Jewish National Fund, it lags far behind the increase in the price of land in Palestine, Mr. Ussischkin, the head of the Jewish National Fund, reported to the last Zionist Congress in August 1935. "More money buys less land now," he said. Professor Brodetsky, in his address to the Congress, declared that the fact remains that the land problem in Palestine remains unsolved. And now, in February 1936 the Palestine Government has announced that it is enacting new restrictive legislation to prevent Arabs selling land to

Jews, in order to leave them proper "subsistence areas."

On Mr. Goldman's recommendation, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society of America decided not to undertake the colonisation work in Minnesota. "It needed care, deliberation, and forethought," he warned it.

I am fully convinced [he went on] that our Society at the present moment is not able to undertake and should not assume the responsibility of undertaking the work of colonisation on an extensive scale. We are now overburdened with other equally important work—receiving, relieving and providing employment for those refugees who are not fit subjects for colonisation. Others must relieve us of this special labour. We should resolve that our Society cannot undertake this great work.

Mr. Goldman explained that he was afraid of several things. Above all, he was afraid of the grave responsibility of undertaking to advise and direct the refugees in their efforts to become colonists. It was easier and a less responsible task, it seems, to let them become congested in the cities, as pedlars and small shopkeepers and workers employed in the tailoring and shoemaking sweatshops. He shrank from the "influence which a failure would have upon the Hebrews in general." "Mistakes and failures will discourage," he said, "those who are willing to make an earnest attempt at colonisation. And even more important, are the results which would follow such a failure in the farming communities of America."

In other words, Mr. Goldman and the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society of America were afraid of antisemitism. There were already at that time, he

complained, "unwarranted prejudices against the Jews, which have of late years made themselves felt in many of the cities of this continent." And he was afraid that

a series of failures in the attempts at colonisation would necessarily create a prejudice among the farming classes of the districts in which the colonies would be situated, far more intense and far more deeply rooted than the prejudices shown by the inhabitants of the cities.

The haphazard method of Jewish settlement in America has not prevented a certain amount of antisemitism, and one wonders whether a more healthy, more economically sound organised settlement of the Jewish population would have resulted in any greater degree of antisemitism, or whether it might not have proved to be less intense. But the Jews of America have grown to be an important economic and social factor in the life of the country, and their services are generally recognised.

At the same meeting of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society at which Mr. Goldman submitted his report, Mr. Ellinger, who had just returned from a tour of Europe on its behalf, enquiring into the situation of the Jewish refugees from Russia, reported that

in the face of all the difficulties that presented themselves in the immigration of the exiles to the United States, and fully cognisant thereof, we recognised the fact that America, or rather the United States, is the only land which has room enough, is free and generous enough, which offers an unobstructed field for all occupations and handicrafts, and which knows neither prejudice nor intolerance, but welcomes the labourer and enables him to develop all his faculties. America will change former Russian slaves into freemen

There had been previous proposals for settling large numbers of Jews in the United States. More than half a century earlier, in 1819, a Mr. W. D. Robinson, printed and circulated a pamphlet in London entitled *Memorial addressed to Persons of the Jewish Religion in Europe on the subject of Emigration and Settlement in the United States of North America*. The object was to interest the wealthier Jews in Europe to buy lands in Mississippi and Missouri Territories and to settle Jewish immigrants there. He presents a glowing picture of "Jewish agriculture spreading through the American forests, Jewish towns and villages adorning the banks of the Mississippi and the Missouri rivers."

Five or six years later, in 1825, Mordecai Manuel Noah, American Jewish playwright, journalist, politician, whose father and grandfather had fought on the American side in the War of Independence (his father was one of Washington's aides, and Washington was present at the wedding of his parents) originated a plan to establish a Jewish colony in Grand Island in the State of New York. With the assistance of a Christian friend named Samuel Leggett, he purchased for 16,985 dollars 2,555 acres of land, and issued a manifesto to Jews throughout the world to settle in the new colony, which he named Ararat. "I've had the idea in my head ever since I saw how wretchedly our fellow Jews lived in Europe, when I was over there in 1813," he said. "Grand Island is the place." But the Jews of America and Europe ridiculed his plan, and it had to be abandoned, all that remains being a corner-stone which is still to be seen in the Buffalo Historical Museum, bearing the inscription: "Ararat. A City of Refuge for the Jews. Founded by Mordecai

Manuel Noah, in the Month of Tishri, September 1825, and in the Fiftieth Year of American Independence."

So that it is not surprising that the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society was over-cautious in 1882. Not only Jews were afraid at that time of breaking new ground in the American States. That is why those who were not afraid found valuable opportunities, like the Mormons in Utah. Warnings were issued on all sides, for instance, at that time, about the difficulties of colonisation in the Valley of the Mississippi. People were urged in the handbooks to have

great care. Settlers are very liable [they said] to fevers and agues. Marshy districts and situations on the banks of rivers should be avoided. With this drawback, however [they admitted] the soil is good and the climate will improve as the work of cultivation goes on. The principal districts are Ohio, Indiana and Illinois. To these countries the Americans look forward with great expectations. In Ohio [they said] the land which has been brought into cultivation sells for £10 to £20 per acre ; but that which is not taken up, or in other words, brought into cultivation, is so inferior to the other that it would scarcely be worth the trouble of enclosing and tilling, even were it made a present of to settlers.

Years later, Mr. Zangwill's organisation, the Jewish Territorial Organisation, had to undertake some of the work the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society had found too responsible for it, by opening up a new immigration area in the United States via Galveston, in order to spread the stream of Jewish immigration over the immense region west of the Mississippi and the country at large, since it was concentrating and becoming congested in New York and the Eastern Cities of America and trickling into the West too

slowly. "Within a few years," Zangwill afterwards wrote, "ten thousand souls were more or less happily settled in a territory they had never heard of. The bait here was bread."

Galveston is a port in the Gulf of Mexico, from which the immigrants found their way into various places in Texas and the adjoining States, and probably some even crossed into Mexico, the mention of which recalls to my mind that when, in 1923, an offer of a tract of land for Jewish settlement in Mexico was made to the American Jewish Congress, and was refused by it, because "such a scheme of colonisation is quite beyond the scope of the investigation as understood by the Committee of the American Jewish Congress," Zangwill commented—"Had the Pilgrim Fathers trembled like the American Jewish Congress, that Congress could not have deliberated under such comfortable conditions"—words that might be equally applied to the refusal of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society to go further with the settlement in Minnesota.

Zangwill and the Jewish Territorial Organisation had previously thought of the possibilities in Mexico, and Zangwill pays tribute in one of his essays to the "journey to Mexico on our behalf" of Joseph Fels, the single-tax advocate, of Fels-Naphtha soap fame, "to obtain a concession of territory from President Diaz." Diaz, it seems, "was more than willing to facilitate a large immigration of Jewish industrial and commercial workers, but did not welcome the idea of a special territory upon an agricultural basis." "It has just transpired, however," Zangwill adds, that in 1890

Diaz himself sought to attract a large Jewish colonisation in Mexico and that he was even willing to pay the expenses of a scientific commission to investigate his offer. Our Organisation was not then in existence, and this, like many another chance in Canada and Australasia was let slip.

This time (in 1923) President Obregon had made an offer of a tract of land in Mexico for the purposes of a Jewish settlement.

Obviously [writes Zangwill] enquiry was needed of the possibility of extraordinary immigration: immigration in the shape of colonisation of a specifically allotted territory, safeguarded by special conditions. The first step in such an enquiry was to ascertain the character and climate of the region proposed by President Obregon. Originally, for example, Lower California had been suggested: a Province the Jewish Territorial Organisation had rejected nearly 20 years before for its aridity and which was not even free from litigious issues. Mr. Rothenberg (through whom President Obregon made his offer) cabled me that a tract of five million acres in Chinahua had been substituted, free from any necessity either of irrigation or litigation. According to State Documents the Mexican Government was willing to cede large tracts of national land in Chiapas, Tabasco or Quintana, though it frankly advised that superior tracts climatically could be obtained by private purchase. But whatever the region offered it was clearly the business of the American Jewish Congress to have despatched thither a reliable scientific expedition, and to have published the Report of its experts together with a full statement of the Mexican terms and conditions. On what grounds has the Congress neglected its plain duty? On the grounds that a large colonisation scheme would involve "enormous sums of money" and "innumerable and immeasurable difficulties." But these [says Zangwill] are the conditions attaching to all colonisation. On these grounds President Obregon's offer would have been rejected as soon as it was made.

On these grounds every other offer stands rejected before it is made. If Canada or Australia were to propose setting aside a tract, there would be the same difficulties.

The Palestine work [Zangwill continues] has shown sufficiently that we have pioneer farmers and other hardy elements able and willing to endure the first primitive labours. And on the basis of these rural activities, urban industries soon arise by way of complement, and little towns begin to spring up.

As for the money necessary, such sums are neither to be had nor to be demanded from philanthropy. The development of the earth's surface is a business upon which millions are expended daily all over the globe, and few territories can count on such a sure source of profit as lies in the steady and ever-increasing influx of a Jewish labour-force. It is not even necessary that the Land Development Company should be Jewish.

Were men to be deterred by difficulties [he concludes] there would be an end to the taming of our planet. Had the Pilgrim Fathers trembled like the American Jewish Congress, that Congress could not have deliberated under such comfortable conditions.

No Organisation [Zangwill said on another occasion] can undertake the expense or the responsibility of the settling of millions of emigrants in a new land. Nor will millions of emigrants, with means of their own respond to the call of any Organisation. Masses of emigrants will only go where they can earn their living, and the most that any Organisation can do is to help to throw open to them a territory of such a nature that their gradual and spontaneous streaming towards this territory will of itself achieve the result.

There are other difficulties in Mexico than those of settlement proper, it seems. For since 1923, though the American Jewish Congress refused to go further with the plan, considerable numbers of Jews have settled in the country. These Jewish immigrants are estimated to number about twelve or fifteen thousand.



Anita Brenner, a Jewess born in Mexico, has written of them that "they arrived at the nation's lowest moment." Ten years of terrible internal conflict had left the country bankrupt, hungry, exhausted spiritually. But the Jews came from countries in much the same or worse conditions : they were as familiar with suffering as the Mexicans, and when they came to know of them did not long nurse terror of them.

At first, as pedlars they walked the streets. When there began to be too many pedlars in the streets, more and more of them went into distant towns, into villages, ranch settlements and Indian villages. By the time the old people and women began to come, and kosher butcher shops multiplied, most of the younger pioneers had fitted themselves into the economic crevices of national life. An unusual number of them dropped buying and selling. Those who had training in professions or crafts practised them—tailoring, shoemaking, watch-repairing. A great many of these made this training the starting-point for small shops or factories. Some invested in freight and passenger automobiles. Jews in Mexico are now fruit-shippers, musicians, mechanics, tyre importers, radio and electric appliance suppliers, booksellers, tailors, weavers, carpenters, sign-painters, journalists, chauffeurs, detectives, teachers, cinema owners, shopkeepers, mattress-makers, miners, farmers, doctors, dentists.

In Mexico any business is a good business because so little has been done. Mexico is still essentially an agricultural country. Not a single field, industrial, commercial, scientific, has been more than tapped, with the possible exception of oil and mines. Even at that, there is much more oil and mine country than has been developed.

There are extensive coal beds, whole States of them, slashed by waterfalls that pulse with power. There is great need and demand for transportation, and not enough vehicles and roads, but especially not enough vehicles. There are fibres, woods, clays, metals, furs, plants and herbs valuable chemically—it must be remembered that quinine, belladonna, chocolate, vanilla, rubber, cork all grow wild in Mexico. Oranges have spread quickly over many acres. Olives, grapes and other transplantations from Spain have proved profitable. In many places there is sufficient rain and rich enough soil (never scratched more than six inches by primitive ploughs) to produce two crops a year.

As for the 12,000 or so Jewish immigrants in Mexico, they work like men interested in building a permanent home for themselves in Mexico. They neither flaunt nor gloss over their identity. They have rooted there, are an integral part of the nation, or integrating; certainly not seen or felt as a class apart. I have been told that some of them marry Mexicans, and all of them speak Spanish and are interested in National affairs, and that this is "assimilation" and deplorable. I do not know why it is deplorable. I do not see why it follows that they lose their "Jewishness" by being Mexican. But deplorable or not, it is a fact.

Another writer in Mexico City, Carleton Beals, does not see the prospect quite so rosilily.

Mexico is thirsting for national unity [he writes]. It is a nation in the throes of birth, and the claims of a new nation upon the world are often exaggerated. Mexico demands special consideration because it is weak and incompetent and new at the game. And so it expresses its doubt of itself by taking it out in an assured attack on resident foreigners, unable to protect themselves.

But in Mexico [he continues] both brown-skinned Indian and lily-white Creole are Mexican citizens, and whatever

their economic disparity equal in the eyes of the law. We think of Mexico as a projection of Spain [he goes on]. This is to distort the picture. Two million people in Mexico do not speak Spanish, another million refuse to speak it. A hundred years of independence have never quite ironed out the previous three centuries of conquest in a way to create a real nation in the modern sense. No Jew need think that in Mexico he has found a safe haven. With Mexico's long record of racial strife and bloody reprisals, with her utter lack of religious and political tolerance, with her new afan for nationalism, with her recurring waves of anti-foreign sentiment, the Jewish residents, directly in proportion to their commercial and social importance, will have to face moments of serious difficulty. As usual it is the poorer immigrant most likely to suffer, because here is the direct fringe of contact.

But meanwhile, he tells us,

the small Jewish pedlar has braved the hardships of mountain trails, of jungles, fevers and inclement weather, of revolution, of bandits, of native prejudices, of discriminatory taxes, and has carted his wares into the remotest hamlets. You meet him everywhere on the trail with his cargo of cloth goods, shawls, shoes, sewing-machines, beds, kitchen utensils, phonographs, pictures. He ventures further than the Spanish trader ever ventured, and he has introduced a hundred new articles of daily use into primitive regions, articles previously unknown. He is distinctly helping to make the more backward sections of Mexico consumers of civilised goods. He has also exercised an appreciable cultural influence on the rural districts of Mexico. Here is a new field for him, a fascinating rôle in the development of modern Mexico.

Little has been said here of the unsettled political conditions in Mexico, which it would be dangerous to overlook. Civil war has been chronic there for decades. But, says an authority, "Mexico is exceedingly rich in

gold, silver and oil, besides owning millions of acres of first-rate land ready for cultivation. Governed from Washington, it might easily become one of the wealthiest countries of the world."

The Jewish Territorial Organisation, of which Zangwill was President, and which had discussed with President Diaz the possibilities of Jewish settlement in Mexico, had come into existence as a result of the refusal of the majority of the Zionist Organisation and the Zionist Congress to accept an offer of Jewish settlement on an autonomous basis in British East Africa, generally spoken of at that time as Uganda.

Joseph Chamberlain it was [writes Zangwill] who first tempted Dr. Herzl with portions of the British Empire, first with El-Arisch in the Sinai Peninsula, and—when the Khedival Government made difficulty about deflecting the water—with a small plateau in British East Africa. I converted Mr. Chamberlain to the conception of not a plateau, but the whole of British East Africa turned into a British Judea. But a Chamberlain is rare. It apparently requires a most abnormal Statesman to see that an Empire which is trying to hold a fifth of the globe with an external force of some ten million whites would be strengthened by a powerful and well-populated Jewish colony.

There are at a low estimate ten million Jews in the world [Dr. Herzl wrote in one of his memorandums]. If Britain will give us the necessary territorial concession, she will at one stroke win not only the hundreds of thousands of Jews who will immigrate to the new land to fertilise it with their capital and their labour and to create peaceful homes, but all the other Jews of the world, who will adhere to Britain morally, if not politically. Britain will obtain ten million agents to work for her greatness and influence and her economic well-being.

I saw a land for you while I was on my travels [Dr. Herzl

reports Chamberlain saying to him when he received him on his return from Uganda]. It is Uganda. It is hot on the coast, but the climate in the interior is excellent for Europeans. You can plant sugar and cotton there. And I thought to myself, "That would be a land for Dr. Herzl! But he will only go to Palestine or near to it."

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, speaking at Limehouse on December 15, 1904, contended that England was already too full of population to be able to absorb new immigrants.

I, for one [he went on, however], am not going to press hardly upon these poor people. They have been driven from their homes by the pressure of want, by the grossest and most brutal persecution, and I think they are subjects for pity and for practical sympathy. The problem is how are they to be saved from the fate which is befalling them, how is their salvation to be accomplished, without the ruin of our own people at home? I had several conferences with the late Dr. Herzl, a man who made upon me the greatest impression, whose sincerity and patriotism and ability were such as must have provoked the regard of any one who became aware of them. And in principle, at any rate, I can say that we were agreed that the best solution of this question was to find some country in this world of ours, if possible, under the ægis of the British flag, or under the protection, if you please, of a concert of nations, in which these poor exiles from their native land, who do not leave it out of caprice, or with any desire to injure us, could dwell in safety, following their religion and their own aspirations. That was our object. That is the solution of the question.

To-day, thirty years and more after Mr. Chamberlain delivered this speech, that is still "the solution of the question."

But Mr. Chamberlain's idea met with opposition on the part of Sir Henry Johnston, who was then British

Special Commissioner in Uganda, and who afterwards became a friend of Israel Zangwill's, and interested himself in his plans to find a place of Jewish settlement, objected to Uganda being handed over for autonomous colonisation.

There is land which can be occupied by Jews of Eastern Europe [he wrote]. But I should strongly deprecate the foundation of an autonomous Jewish State as an imperium in imperio, not because the autonomous State is Jewish, but because a divided Government means a divided responsibility. Subject to this, the Jew will be as welcome in the waste places of East Africa as the Christian, and there is no doubt a moderate amount of room for both.

The amount of room was, according to his expert knowledge, exceedingly moderate.

The coast belt [he said] is tropical and unhealthy and is already fairly well inhabited by Negroes, Arabs and nations of India. Many other parts are peopled, some thinly, some thickly, by Negroes, Negroids, or people of Gala race. A very large proportion of the northern parts of the British East African Protectorate is at the present day almost uninhabitable by any type of humanity, owing to its lack of water. When all deductions have been made, it is scarcely likely that the British Government will have more than 20,000 square miles of land to offer to European settlers, and this land is not absolutely continuous.

Questions were also asked in the House of Commons. Mr. Cathcart Wason, the member for Orkney and Shetland, repeatedly questioned Earl Percy, the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who explained in his replies that

a lease of 500 square miles of land, on terms approved by His Majesty's Treasury, is now being arranged with the East African Syndicate. The lease will be subject to the

provisions of the East African Crown Lands Ordinance, 1902, under which the rights of natives are fully reserved. No cession of territory is contemplated. The conditions of the lease to the Jewish Colonial Trust are under discussion.

It is ironic that a number of people at the time seemed to be under the impression that the Jews were after "gold mines in East Africa," when what impelled Dr. Herzl was the poverty and suffering of the Russian Jews, and the desire to establish them in a place of refuge. Many Zionists, however, refused to consider Jewish settlement except in Palestine, and fiercely opposed the Uganda scheme (though at least one seems to have opposed it because he did not believe in the possibilities of White colonisation in Africa), and the Zionist movement was split in consequence. "If it comes to a split, my heart remains with the Zionists and my reason with the Africans (Territorialists)," Herzl, who died in the midst of the controversy, declared. "I must say now that in Palestine there nothing to be done for the near future."

There then emerged a new body, the Jewish Territorial Organisation, which sought to obtain the right to take over the scheme. But by the time it was constituted and could make an official approach, it was too late. Mr. Alfred Lyttleton, who was then the Colonial Secretary, wrote to Mr. Zangwill under the date, September 16, 1905, that on receiving

official notification of the decision of the Zionist Congress not to proceed further with the matter of a Zionist settlement in East Africa, I informed the Commissioner for the East African Protectorate that the land which had been proposed for the settlement need not be reserved any longer.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE QUEST OF THE JEWISH TERRITORIAL ORGANISATION

THE Jewish Territorial Organisation then proceeded to look elsewhere. The aim of the Zionist Organisation was defined in the Basle Programme as follows : " The aim of Zionism is to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law." Against this, the Jewish Territorial Organisation put its own formula : " The object of the Jewish Territorial Organisation is to acquire a territory upon an autonomous basis for those Jews who cannot or will not remain in the lands in which they live at present."

Though the Jewish Territorial Organisation (the Ito) was founded by dissentients from the Zionist Organisation, and the two bodies were pursuing divergent aims, there were however in both men who made no secret of their sympathy with the rival organisation. Dr. Max Nordau, Herzl's chief lieutenant, wrote to Zangwill on October 1, 1905 :

I maintain that one can be a Territorialist and a Zionist at the same time, Territorialism aiming only at immediate relief, while Zionism strives for the final solution of the Jewish problem, which in my opinion can be found only in Palestine. I wish you Godspeed with all my heart !



And nearly twelve years later, early in 1917, Nordan was writing in the same spirit :

It is very well possible and even obligatory to serve at the same time the ideal and the immediate practical needs. We must distinguish between Jewry and individual Jews. We must certainly work for Jewry, but we must do it steadily, without hurry, though vigorously, because it can wait and is sure to outlive every one of us ; but the Jew cannot wait ; he may starve, he may perish ; we must aid him without a day lost.

Professor Mandelstamm, a famous Russian Zionist, joined Zangwill as the Ito leader in Russia. Cyrus Sulzberger, Vice-President of the American Zionist Federation, became the American Ito leader, and another prominent American Zionist, Dr. S. Solis Cohen, wrote in 1906, " As I have found no conflict between American citizenship and Zionism, so I find no conflict between continued adherence to Zionism and participation in the work of the Ito."

Later, Zangwill, when " by one of those unexpected happenings which are the only certainties in history, Zionism received from Great Britain, with the support of other Great Powers, the promise that a Jewish National Home ' shall be established in Palestine,' " wrote that

while the possibility of this project is on trial the Ito naturally lays aside any rival activities, hoping even that its ends may be attainable within the same territory. For the Ito to oppose any practicable plan for a Jewish territory would be not only treason to the Jewish people but to its own programme.

One of Zangwill's relatives, a close associate in the Ito, Dr. Eder. became a leading Zionist, and other former

Itoists taking a prominent part in the Palestine work, either in the Zionist Organisation, or in the Jewish Agency for Palestine, include Sir Osmond d'Avigdor Goldsmid, Mr. James de Rothschild, M.P., Sir Philip Hartog, Dr. Alfred Klee, Professor Nahum Slousch, Mr. Walter S. Cohen, of the Palestine Economic Board, and (the late) Sir Meyer Spielman.

Before the "unexpected happening" which brought from Great Britain the promise of a Jewish National Home in Palestine, the Ito explored the possibilities of Jewish settlement in a number of other countries besides Mexico. It put forward Mesopotamia—

the primitive Jewish land, the cradle of the race and the conservatory of its purity, as well as the subsequent focus of Judaism for a thousand years, the seat of its most famous academies and the birthplace of the Babylonian Talmud.

Herzl had also thought of Mesopotamia. Oscar Straus, the United States Ambassador to Turkey, had suggested it to him, and Dr. Cyrus Adler, now President of the American Jewish Committee, and who was for a time President of the Administrative Council of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, had written a pamphlet on the subject. "Mesopotamia was the original home of Israel," Herzl commented in his diaries. "Abraham came from Mesopotamia. We could there, too, link on the mystical. And there are no Church rivalries in Mesopotamia."

The scheme persisted right up to the outbreak of the war, and during the war it was revived by Mr. Herman Landau, an Anglo-Jewish philanthropist, who founded the Jewish Shelter in London, through which "more than a million Jewish emigrants and transmi-

grants have been assisted since it was founded in 1886." (He was during the War President of the Palestine Relief Board, of which Dr. Weizmann was Chairman.) Mr. Landau saw vast commercial possibilities in the scheme, which was to reconvert Mesopotamia into a world-granary by irrigating it and settling it with Jewish homesteads under the British flag.

"The gathering together of the Jews in Mesopotamia, the setting up of a Jewish crown colony there under British sovereignty, is so possible that I, old as I am, hope to live to see it done," Mr. Herman Landau said in an interview in *The American Hebrew* in April 1917.

I propose that an association be formed of Jews of every country, to obtain from the British Government a concession of the waste lands of Mesopotamia as a Chartered Company or otherwise, with an International Board of Directors, representing the Jewish shareholders of the various countries; the ultimate property in the land and irrigation works to pass to the colony when the capital invested is fully repaid.

The association will begin at once the reconstruction of the ancient canals by modern methods, using for the labour required, that of the earliest of the newcomers, who would be paid, housed and fed while so engaged. Immediately on the completion of each section of the scheme the land should be surveyed, cleared of scrub, levelled, ploughed and prepared for cultivation. The settlement would be in charge of British officials, either from Egypt or India, accustomed to irrigation agriculture, and able to direct the efforts of the settlers. Sir William Wilcox, the greatest authority on irrigation work alive, is now in Egypt, and I am expecting a confidential report from him on the matter. Our scheme provides for a gradual extension of activities. The first section to be attacked is the one and a third million acres between Bagdad on the Tigris and Kufa on the Euphrates. Sir

William Wilcox's estimate, allowing 100 per cent for contingencies and about £4 per acre for reclamation, demands a capital outlay of ten million spread over three or four years. The land reclaimed, he estimates at about £30 per acre, one quarter of what similar Egyptian land is worth, so that the association have ample security for their money. This land value is a minimum one, and will evidently be much greater under good government and with the increased facilities for transport that will be provided. Ten millions sterling of expenditure is estimated to bring under the plough £40,000,000 of land now waste, £26,000,000 will create a capital value which is estimated at £90,000,000 even under the conditions of Turkish rule. We have estimated double the working expenses, we have calculated these for a régime of bribery and exaction, and still show a profit of 9 per cent. Is not the investment a sound one under British auspices? I have the example before me of the prosperity and remunerative nature of all land companies in Egypt, which have always been able to raise money under most favourable conditions from the investing public. I see no great difficulty in dealing with that as a financial proposition.

The whole idea seems remote, however, to-day when Mesopotamia has become the extremely race-conscious Arab kingdom of Iraq.

The El-Arisch scheme to which Zangwill referred, was first broached by Dr. Herzl to Lord Rothschild in the summer of 1902, at the same time that he proposed a Jewish settlement in Cyprus. In October he spoke to Joseph Chamberlain about it. Chamberlain told him that he could discuss only Cyprus, because the Sinai Peninsula came under the department of the Foreign Office. As for Cyprus, there were Greeks and Moslems already there, and he could not consider having them pushed aside by new immigrants. At the same time he would like to help if he could, and

he suggested that Herzl should put his El-Arisch idea to Lord Lansdowne, the Foreign Minister. Herzl accordingly drew up a memorandum, that he sent to Zangwill to be translated into English, in which he asked for a concession for the settlement of El-Arisch to be granted to the Jewish Eastern Company, with a capital of five million pounds. The company would undertake systematic settlement work. It would immediately send out a staff of technical and agricultural experts to prepare for the building of streets, railways and harbours, and parcellate the land for occupation. The immigration would be organised through the Zionist organisations in the various countries. Not only the hungry Jews of Eastern Europe would go there to find work, but there would also be people with capital who would start important enterprises. In a few years, the British Empire would have a new prosperous colony.

Every place on which a house now stands was once an empty site, and Venice was built not even on sand, but on water [he wrote]. People are the riches of a country, and these people will be an acquisition to the British Empire. It will gain not only the hundreds of thousands of immigrants, who will fertilise the land with their capital and their labour, and set up peaceful homes. All other Jews throughout the world will not politically, but morally, be found on the side of Britain.

He then saw Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Cromer was consulted, and finally an expedition was sent out to El-Arisch to examine the possibilities of both the agricultural and urban settlement of the area lying between the Suez Canal and the Turkish frontier along the Mediterranean, as well as the Hinterland. Mr.

Leopold Kessler, an engineer of standing, was appointed leader of the expedition, and geological expert. Dr. Joffe was to report on the climatic and health conditions, Mr. Oscar Marmorek on roads, town-planning and house-building, Mr. Laurent on planting questions, and Mr. J. H. Stephens had to enquire into the questions of harbour, canalising the Nile, boring for wells, and all questions relating to water. It was on this question of water that the project failed. According to Mr. Stephens, two to three million cubic metres of Nile waters were necessary. Sir William Garstin, the Secretary of State for Public Works, however, said that five times as much water would be needed, and also the laying of the syphon would hold up the Suez traffic for a number of weeks.

My whole Sinai plan has collapsed [Herzl wrote to Lord Rothschild]. All was complete. It depended only on Sir William Garstin's opinion whether we could get the Nile water we need. Sir William disputed the figures given by our engineer, Stephens. He contended that we need five times as much Nile water as Stephens calculated, and Egypt could not spare so much. Thus the entire project has collapsed. Much time and some money has been lost (the El-Arisch Expedition cost us about £4,000, Herzl has recorded elsewhere), but I am not discouraged. Already, I have another plan.

This was the Uganda plan which, too, as we have seen, came to nothing. But Herzl did not cease to hope and work. Shortly before he died he wrote to Mr. Jacob Schiff, the American Jewish banker, who afterwards did much to help Zangwill's Jewish Territorial Organisation (Ito), asking for an opportunity to talk with him about matters relating to Jewish emigration. His death made the meeting impossible.

The Ito also investigated Cyrenaica, which then, like Mesopotamia, belonged to Turkey, and Angola, both in Africa, the first in the North, the other in the Equatorial South West.

Professor Nahum Slousch wrote in his report to the Ito :

Cyrenaica, which Joseph considered as the prolongation of Palestine beyond the Nile, has in all times served as a centre of colonisation for the Hebrew race. No country of the Diaspora, with the possible exception of Mesopotamia, has played so leading a rôle in the history of the people of Israel. We may even say that no Judaism, with the exception of that of Judea, has played a social and political rôle as predominant as that of Cyrenaica.

Cyrenaica has since been annexed by Italy, " despite the Report of our Scientific Commission," writes Zangwill, " that it was not good enough even for the homeless Jews." The Scientific Commission of which Zangwill speaks was one of experts, headed by Professor Gregory, who also headed the later expedition to Angola.

We found Cyrenaica disappointing in spite of its many attractive features [Professor Gregory reported] because it is not so unoccupied as we had expected, and its present inhabitants would prove a serious difficulty to its closer agricultural settlement. We found a country, moreover, less fertile than is reported, for though the soils are excellent, they are very patchy, and the country is better suited for pastoral than agricultural occupation. I was forced to the conclusion that owing to the scarcity of water the country never has supported and probably never will support a dense population.

The chief difficulty here, too, seems to have been the lack of water. " The whole country is composed

of very porous limestone through which the rainfall percolates till it reaches sea level," the engineers, Messrs. Middleton, Hunter and Duff, said in their report. And Zangwill commented: "In the most painfully literal sense of that much-abused metaphor, the project did not hold water."

Professor Gregory went on to deal with previous attempts at colonisation made in Cyrenaica.

The Turks [he said] tried to colonise it with Circassian and Cretan refugees. Both efforts have been unsuccessful. The Italians prospected the land with great energy from 1880 to 1885, and then with lessening vigour until the Italian commercial agency at Benghazi was abandoned in 1896. Italy is still endeavouring to widen her influence in the country by generous help in education and commercial development; but the Italians appear generally to realise how difficult a settlement of the country would be against the hostility of the Turks [owners] and Arabs [inhabitants].

But in the end, as we know, Italy annexed Cyrenaica.

The Cyrenaica Commission went very fully into the question of making the country habitable. There were detailed plans for building roads, railways, harbours, etc., and a sum of £600,000 was proposed as the cost of constructing the essential means of communication. Dr. Eder, who was a member of the Commission, to report on the health conditions, said that

from the point of view of climate and health it seems unlikely that one would find a more desirable country—one where there is less actual disease or probability of its occurring. The climate in the plateaus where the settlements would be made is splendid. The heat was never overpowering, while the nights were cool (sometimes cold), thus ensuring under ordinary circumstances good sleep.



The absence of beasts of prey, either large, or more important still, small, means that there is no malaria in the country. The epidemics from which the country has suffered in the past have been importations, and have, mainly, affected the inhabitants of the towns on the coast. Under proper administration there should be no real danger from this source.

A fate other than that of being an Itoland has been the lot of Cyrenaica [Dr. Eder wrote in 1932]. I do not know the results of Italian Settlements, but it never seemed impossible that by the expenditure of several millions some system of water conservation might be carried out. We Ito Jews had no millions.

The Angola Report was published in 1913, and was to have been considered by the Ito Congress which was to have met at Zurich in the very month the war broke out. The Congress consequently never met, and the Angola project was shelved.

Under the text of a Bill passed in 1912 by the Portuguese Parliament, the Portuguese Government had been "authorised to grant concessions of land on the high plateaus of the Province of Angola to Jewish immigrants who shall submit to the stipulations of this law and become naturalised Portuguese by the terms of this law." Naturalisation was to be effected on payment of a fee of one dollar. The immigrants were to be introduced by some lawfully established Jewish societies, and were required to be in possession of sufficient capital for the agricultural and industrial working of the concessions. Portuguese was to be the language exclusively taught in the schools and used in the public services.

If I were asked by an ordinary Scottish farmer whether I would advise him to go to Angola or to such countries as

Canada, Australia, or British East Africa, I would certainly not advise him to go to Angola [Professor Gregory wrote in his report to the Ito, summing up the conclusions arrived at by the Investigation Commission]. But it is owing to the drawbacks of the country [he went on] that there is a chance of establishing a colony in correspondence with your programme. I have considered the suitability of Angola rather for refugees who wish to escape poverty and ill-treatment in their own countries and wish to remain in a Jewish community. I assume that such refugees would be willing to work with greater patience than ordinary commercial settlers. I thought this country more hopeful for refugee immigrants than for any other class. I see no reason why such settlers should not in time build up a colony for themselves.

So far as the hardships and the need to work with greater patience are concerned, Zangwill commented :

Nor has it ever been the Ito's view that our colonists are to enjoy either a featherbed or a fire-proof existence. The Jew, if he wishes to obtain a land of his own, cannot be wholly guaranteed from those risks which were cheerfully run—by the founders of every one of those United States to which the Jew now hies himself with such a sense of security.

But there were other difficulties, too. "The negotiations for Angola," Zangwill writes elsewhere, "were handicapped by the fiscal narrowness of Portuguese colonial policy."

There are still people interested in the possibilities of a Jewish settlement in Angola. I have just received a long memorandum drawn up by Dr. Manfred Kirschberg, who has made a study of the question, in conjunction with an engineer and agronomist, Fritz Buber, who has lived in Angola for ten years. In this memorandum it is claimed that the climate of

Angola is very favourable for white settlement, that the country is never too wet or too dry, that the soil is fertile and yields abundantly if European agricultural methods are employed, and that there are considerable mineral resources, iron, coal, copper, petroleum, gold and diamonds, so that it is possible, in time, to develop important industries. Angola already has excellent harbours, important railway lines and a big system of roads, the memorandum continues, and the character of the country makes it easy to build good motor-roads. The Portuguese authorities maintain excellent order in the country, and are friendly to immigrants, whose permanent settlement they are anxious to facilitate, in order to promote the development of the colony. Lobito, the principal harbour, is described as a city according to European standards, with big warehouses, factories, banks, hotels, a fine railway station, and good and frequent shipping communication with the European ports, while the capital, Huambo (Nove Lisboa), is 1,600 metres above sea-level, and is a fine city, able to provide Europeans with all accustomed comfort, and Silva Porto, about 2,000 metres above sea-level, is on the Benguela Railway, and is a centre of agricultural settlement, consisting chiefly of Germans.

And I see that there is a letter in the *Jewish Chronicle* of April 17, from a correspondent who urges a revival of the East Africa project, without "detracting in the slightest from the Palestine Movement."

I have said that at least one prominent Zionist opposed the Uganda scheme not out of hostility to territorialism as such, but because he did not believe in the possibility of successful white settlement in Africa. and above all in East Africa. He does not

seem to have been altogether alone. For in a very excellent miscellany published in German in 1905, called *The Voice of the Truth*, there is an article by the editor of the compilation, Mr. Lazar Schoen, under the heading "Palestine or East Africa," in which, after setting out the climatic and other disadvantages of Uganda, he proceeds to say:

East Africa is not to be compared with the Argentine colonies. These are situated, after all, in a country that has for centuries been under Spanish influence, in a land of the future that lies in the track of advancing civilisation that goes from East to West.

And Dr. Alfred Nossig, writing in the same volume, put up against Uganda a plan of Eastern colonisation, El-Arisch in the Sinai Peninsula, Cyprus, and along the Bagdad Railway, Mesopotamia and also Anatolia. That is a substitute for Uganda, he declared. We would always prefer an area bordering on Palestine. And he accused Zangwill of having completely abandoned Palestine, of having formulated his aim not as, "we strive to obtain Palestine, but will colonise Uganda for the time being," but, "we want to have nothing more to do with Palestine. It is a dead country. Any other place but Palestine." But the editor of the miscellany could have told him that he was printing in the same volume an article by Zangwill, which he (the editor) referred to in his own contribution, describing very glowingly "The Commercial Future of Palestine."

I share, as it happens, the doubts (I might phrase it more strongly) of the possibility of white settlement in Africa, but sometimes, reading the vehement articles and speeches of the "Palestine only" Zionists

rejecting the Uganda offer (and apparently oblivious of the considerable English opposition to the Government going on with the scheme), one is struck by the force of Zangwill's comment in another similar connection: "The only comfort I can find in the whole episode is that it supplies yet another refutation of the calumny that 'the Elders of Zion' wish to conquer the world. Why, they would not have it as a gift."

The Ito also investigated the possibilities in Canada and Australia. Zangwill relates that Lord Strathcona jumped up on a chair to point out to him on a wall-map the territory he thought the Canadian Government would allot the Ito. Lord Strathcona arranged an interview for Zangwill with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Canadian Premier. But Sir Wilfrid said to Zangwill:

You are ten years too late. Ten years ago we were begging for immigrants and would gladly have given you a tract under local autonomy to be developed into one of the States of a federal Canada. Now we have all the immigration we need and will give land only to the individual.

Sir Wilfrid added, says Zangwill,

that if we chose to send out our men—each to make individual application for his 160 acres—and if we so placed their holdings as to produce a Jewish commonwealth, the Canadian Government would not try to thwart a scheme executed under its constitution.

But at that time, he continues, "to carry out such a scheme without the glamour and protection of public policy, and in face of the Zionist clamour and the anti-Zionist outcry did not seem feasible."

As for Australia, Zangwill continues,

I found Sir Alfred Deakin, the Premier, as inflexible as Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and a lengthy negotiation with Sir

Newton Moore regarding Western Australia (which dots the population of Portsmouth over a million square miles) yielded no better results.

It seems, however, that Sir Alfred Deakin suggested to the Ito the Northern Territory of Australia, which Zangwill did not consider desirable—"a derelict tropical desert," he called it.

To Zangwill and the Ito the general conception evolved into a British-Jewish scheme of creating a Jewish land of refuge in some part of the Empire in need of white population. Joseph Chamberlain, says Zangwill, "promised to take the platform on behalf of the scheme whenever I should give the word. Mr. Winston Churchill showed a similar imaginative sympathy with the British-Jewish scheme."

I am well aware [Zangwill explains] that a Jewish colony in Australia or Canada could never reach the measure of autonomy possible in a possession like East Africa. But under the general laws of the Dominions a new State could be easily carved out from the vast area of unoccupied territory. Canada and Australia are Continents that have the misfortune or the modesty to mistake themselves for countries. They apply to three million square miles conceptions that would be narrow for three thousand. But three million square miles of homogeneous humanity have never yet afflicted our planet.

St. John Ervine discovered that when he went to America :

Americans are dispersed over so vast a territory that a national identity becomes almost physically impossible. Chicago is a thousand miles from New York, and that is only a third of the distance from one side of the United States to the other. Let a reader take a ruler and mark off on the map of Europe where he would land if he were

due east from England for 3,000 miles, he would find himself in the solitudes of Asia. It is true that there is more identity of life between New York and Chicago than there is between London and Moscow, but how much more is there? The Californian and the New Yorker speak the same language, except for a few local expressions, but I doubt if there is as much identity of mind and habit between them as there is between a Virginian and a Southern Englishman or between a New Englander and an Ulsterman.

And Professor F. J. Turner of Harvard University, says in his book *Frontiers in American History* :

Indeed, the United States is in size and natural resources an empire, a collection of potential nations, rather than a single nation. It is comparable in area to Europe. Within this vast empire there are geographic provinces, separate in physical conditions, into which American colonisation has flowed, and in each of which a special society has developed, with an economic, political and social life of its own, and economic combinations and contests may be traced by the student who looks below the surface of the national life to the actual grouping of states in congressional votes on tariff, currency, banking and all the varied legislation in the field of commerce. Three hundred years ago, adventurous Englishmen on the coast of Virginia began the attack on the wilderness. And—to-day? America, to-day!

In speaking of the offer of Jewish settlement in Mexico, Zangwill had made it clear that "the demand that the immigrants adopt Mexican nationality constitutes no contradiction to the Territorialist conception of 'autonomous basis.' The main function of this 'autonomous basis' is to secure the continuity of immigration." And this interpretation of "autonomous basis" was emphasised even more clearly when Zangwill accepted Lucien Wolf's attitude that autonomy would

mean that "such a colony in the vast waste lands of the British Empire would be politically Jewish only through the preponderance of its Jewish population."

While the Ito was seeking opportunities for large-scale autonomous Jewish settlement, it did not neglect the immediate regulation of immigration, "in view of needs that could not await the foundation of a State," and it was on this basis that it started the Galveston immigration work, which settled tens of thousands of Jews in the sparsely populated Mississippi States. Zangwill first approached the Ica for financial help for the scheme, but "the Ica would not finance the Galveston scheme. I went to the Rothschilds, who at once financed the European end of it."<sup>1</sup>

Herzl had the same idea when he said to Joseph Chamberlain: "I have time to negotiate, but my people has not. They are starving in the Pale. I must bring them immediate help." And Nordau:

The individual Jew cannot wait; we must aid him at once, without a day's loss. This is clearly our duty. Let us strive for the acquisition of Palestine, by all means. But let us hasten to help the tormented individual Jew.

It is ever the tendency of the present to push the past into the background. "The higher a man has to carry the raw material of thought before he works it up, the more it costs him in blood, nerve and muscle," said Oliver Wendell Holmes. And there is a growing tendency now, confronted by the existing persecution

<sup>1</sup> Jacob H. Schiff financed the American end. He gave half a million dollars towards it. The members of the American Galveston Committee included his brother-in-law, Professor Morris Loeb, Cyrus L. Sulzberger, Abraham Elkus, later U.S. Minister to Turkey, Judge Nathan Bijur, David M. Bressler, Max J. Kohler, Dr. Julius Goldman and Morris D. Waldman.



in Germany whose victims we see and hear, "the entire tragedy of the Jews in Germany which staggers imagination," as Stefan Zweig writes,

the catastrophe that has come upon the Jews of Germany, has affected all alike, people of all ages, men and women, has torn away innumerable people from their home, from their work, from all that life meant to them, from a community of which they had formed part for centuries, a record of devastation,

to forget what "starving in the Pale" of which Herzl spoke to Chamberlain meant, and what the massacres that took place in old Russia were really like.

Alexander III [says the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*] continued to be guided in his attitude towards the Jews by the procurator of the Holy Synod, Pobiedonostzev, who is reported to have said that one-third of the Jews in Russia would be forced to emigrate, another third would be compelled to accept baptism and the remainder would be brought to the verge of starvation.

### Restrictions and civil disabilities were multiplied

and obstacles were raised also to the exercise of the Jewish religion. The violence of minor officials increased and Jewish inhabitants were summarily expelled. Early in 1891 the banishment of the Jews from Moscow was determined upon. The intention of the administration was kept secret until the first and second days of Passover, a time deemed convenient by the police for entrapping a great number of Jews. 14,000 Jewish artisans were thus banished from Moscow. Being unable to find purchasers for their household effects, the exiles frequently left them behind. Similar expulsions occurred in Tula, Novgorod, Kaluga, Ryazan, Riga and other places. Bad as were the economic conditions in the Pale before these expulsions, they became indescribably worse after its population had been augmented by thousands of impoverished refugees from the interior. In the *Journal du Nord* it was stated:

"There are in Russia only 10,000 to 15,000 Jews (out of six million) who possess any certain means of existence. The masses possess nothing. In foreign countries there was ignorance concerning these terrible conditions due to the suppression by the censorship of any mention in the Russian newspapers. But isolated notices which found their way into the foreign Press created a wave of indignation throughout Europe and forced even Pobiedonostzev to make apologetic explanations. Considerable numbers of the more enterprising Jews sought relief in emigration, with the result that during the last two decades of the nineteenth century more than 1,000,000 Jews left Russia, the greater part going to the United States of America. Another movement directly traceable to the repressive legislation in Russia was the growth of nationalism among the Russian Jews, and in the organisation of Zionist societies. The hopes which the Jews of Russia reposed in Nicholas II were not justified by events. His policy while no less oppressive was more evasive. Further restrictive measures were introduced. A blood accusation with its usual sequence, an anti-Jewish riot followed. More anti-Jewish riots and more blood accusations occurred in Cherson, in Vladimir, in Nikolaev and elsewhere in South Russia, and in the following year more riots and blood accusations. As a result the Jewish masses were ruined, and their pitiable condition was intensified by famine which spread in Bessarabia and Kiev. In 1903 notorious expulsions occurred in Kiev, the Caucasus and Moscow. A destructive anti-Jewish riot was allowed to take place in Kishinev through the connivance of the local authorities who were encouraged by the Minister of the Interior, Plehve, and in September a similar riot occurred at Homel. There is a portion of the uneducated Russian people among which the systematic preaching against the Jews has taken firm hold."

"By confining the Jews to the Pale, Russia created a Ghetto greater than any known to the Middle Ages, and by imposing restrictions upon the right to live and travel even within this ghetto she virtually converted it into a

penal settlement where six million human beings guilty only of adherence to the Jewish faith are compelled to live out their lives in squalor and misery, in constant terror of massacre, without legal rights or social status," says a statement issued by the American Jewish Committee in 1916. "Until the recent Revolution the ill-treatment of the Jews in Russia afforded in magnitude and cruelty the worst example of religious persecution known to modern Europe," Lucien Wolf wrote in 1919. "We must remember not only the pogroms," wrote Zangwill, "but what Mr. Lucien Wolf has called, in the title of his invaluable compilation, 'The Legal Sufferings of the Jews in Russia.' At the outbreak of the war the Russian Jews found themselves—with a few privileged exceptions—incarcerated in a Pale whose very villages were prohibited to them, debarred from most offices in State or army and disallowed higher education except for a minute percentage of the candidates—chosen not for their intellectual promise but by lot. Professor Dicey, in an introduction to Mr. Wolf's book, wrote: 'The worst evil of Russian despotism is that it threatens the Jewish subjects of the Czar with moral degradation. The persecution of Russian Jews is not a matter which affects Russia alone. It is assuredly the concern of every civilised State that the slow and laborious progress of mankind should suffer no retrogression.' These Russian Jews," added Zangwill, "are calculated at six millions, a population larger than that of Palestine in the days of Solomon. These Russian Jews are half the Jews of the world and almost the whole Jewish problem."

And so, speaking of the Galveston work, Zangwill wrote :

The intolerable conditions will necessitate a large migration of the masses whom Palestine cannot receive, and who are already taking the ancient road to New York. That was the path of salvation which the instinct of the masses found for itself when the pogroms of the early 'eighties began to break up Russo-Jewish life. There lay the road to salvation and opportunity. America was

pledged to the doctrine of what Roosevelt called "the square deal." There was lacking only the ramifications of the stream of Jewish immigration over the country at large, into the West of which it trickled too slowly. This a department of the Jewish Territorial Organisation strove to precipitate by constituting Galveston an additional port for Jewish immigration. The latest statistics show 37,000 Jews arriving in New York within a few weeks, and the majority departing to join their relatives in the West. It would thus seem that the Galveston work was more successful than one had imagined, and that, exactly as designed, the 10,000 souls planted in the West are now operating as nuclei to attract immigration from the Eastern Slums.

When the Ito was wound up, Mr. Zangwill emphasised again in his closing speech the "successful Galveston emigration," and paid tribute to Dr. Jochelman "who had directed the Galveston work from Russia." And Lucien Wolf in his tribute to Zangwill when he died, said :

It was characteristic of the practical genius of Zangwill that even in the moment of failure he availed himself of a proposal to deal with some of the pressing exigencies of his problem within the practicable limits of conventional emigration. With the support of Mr. Jacob Schiff and Lord Rothschild he carried out the famous Galveston scheme, of which it was truly said in an address presented to him last year, that "it not only rescued many thousands of our Eastern European brethren from bondage and squalor, but did so on a methodical plan of selection and distribution which, if more largely adopted to-day would render immigration restrictions unnecessary and would recognise in the Jewish emigrants a new and valuable source of economic and social fertilisation."

The activities of the Ito, interrupted by the war, were suspended in 1917, when the British Government

issued the Balfour Declaration, promising to use "their best endeavours to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." For as Zangwill declared: "Palestine had never been excluded from the Ito's programme, with which he had done his best to get the Mandate equated." "In view of the work of the Zionist Organisation, its own activities shall be in suspense," the Ito's resolution read. Then, in 1925, the Ito was formally wound up.

I have in my possession a copy dictated by Mr. Zangwill, with notes in his own handwriting, of the report of the meeting of the Headquarters Council of the Ito at which this decision, "to close its activities," was adopted. Mr. Zangwill was not well enough to continue to lead the work. (He died, in fact, the next year.) And he told the meeting that his physicians had warned him to reduce his activities to a minimum. Sir Meyer Spielman, the Vice-President of the Ito, expressed the feeling of those present when he thereupon said that "the Ito without a figurehead like Mr. Zangwill, who carried so much weight, was now hopeless. It might revive later, and perhaps by way of the United States."

He himself [Zangwill declared on that occasion] had almost from the first regarded the Balfour Declaration as fatal to Territorialism, for his own generation, at least. Because although it was unattainable in Palestine, any attempt to establish it elsewhere would be fanatically opposed by Zionists. He had been equally convinced, however, that the pressure of tragic forces would perpetually bring to the surface this solution of the question.

## CHAPTER IX

### ITO REDIVIVUS

"THE pressure of tragic forces," as Zangwill foresaw, has, indeed, brought the Territorialist solution again to the fore.

What has happened in Germany is well known. And so is the distress in Poland and other East European countries. Mr. Sholem Asch, the novelist, during his visit to Palestine in March 1936, told the Palestine Press that "the centre of gravity of the Jewish problem is in Poland, not in Germany." And Colonel Wedgwood, speaking in the House of Commons about the same time, said: "Anyone who knew the conditions in Poland would admit at once that they were ten times worse than they were in Germany. There were millions more Jews there, and they were poor and more easy to starve."

Zangwill was afraid of the prospects of Territorialism for his own generation. His generation is passing. It will be ten years this year since Zangwill died. Most of his chief lieutenants are also dead. Lucien Wolf died five years ago. Sir Meyer Spielman, the Vice-President of the Ito, died early in 1936. And Dr. Eder died in March 1936. And the movement which Zangwill saw would come back to the surface, and which Sir Meyer Spielman believed might revive later,

perhaps by way of the United States, has revived, by way of Germany and Poland. Shcer necessity has revived it. For while Palestine is absorbing thousands of Jews who in Germany, Poland and elsewhere are being forced out of their positions, hundreds of thousands remain because they can find no entry into Palestine. The restrictive immigration laws, the pace of the economic development of the country, and the need of maintaining a proper balance between immigration and employment opportunities result in the inability of hundreds of thousands of would-be Palestine immigrants securing the necessary facilities. There are also many thousands of Jews in these countries who wish to emigrate but would rather not go to Palestine, because of the Jewish national implications this involves, and to which they object. The *Jewish Chronicle* states (February 7, 1936) that

A resolution favouring emigration to all overseas countries except Palestine has been adopted in Berlin by the Association of German Jewish Youth. The Organisation has the support of a number of outstanding non-Zionist leaders in Germany. It is claimed that it has over 9,000 members.

And in an article published on May 1, 1936, the *Jewish Chronicle* writes: "It would be wrong to think that Hitler has made all German Jews into Zionists."

It is the attitude that the late Mr. Lucien Wolf expressed in his letter to Zangwill accepting his invitation to join the Ito—"As for an independent Jewish State in Palestine, I would not entertain such a hope if I thought it possible."

Even the Zionists have declared that they recognise the need of emigration proceeding not only to Palestine.

The need is much greater than Palestine can cope with. The official organ of the German Zionists, the *Juedische Rundschau*, pleads that Canada, Australia and the South American countries should open their doors to admit a certain number of German Jews.

As much as we have naturally concentrated on Palestine [the President of the German Zionist Federation, Dr. Siegfried Moses, declared at the last Zionist Conference held in February 1936] we have recognised from the beginning that emigration to other countries in addition to Palestine is essential. We have never demanded or suggested an emigration monopoly for Palestine. On the contrary, we always held it necessary in the interests of Palestine upbuilding that people who are not fitted for Palestine or who have no inclination to go to Palestine should be able to emigrate to other countries.

The fact is that an official Zionist statement submitted in the middle of March 1936 to the Council for German Jewry, whose members include Sir Herbert Samuel, Sir Osmond d'Avigdor Goldsmid, Lord Bearsted, Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Simon Marks, asks for urgent consideration of the plight of

2,000 young German Jews who have already completed a course of retraining in Germany and are waiting for emigration possibilities. Although they have completed their training, they are still in the training camps and schools in Germany, waiting for the opportunity to leave and meanwhile are blocking the training of others, who, because of the limited capacity of training institutions in Germany, cannot enter their courses until these others are cleared.

Dr. Arthur Ruppin, the Director of the Central Bureau of the Jewish Agency for Palestine for the Settlement of German Jews, has visited South America



and has drawn up an official memorandum in which he proposes the settlement of 200,000 German Jews (nearly half the number still left in Germany) within the next six years, half in Palestine, and the other half in other countries ; and Dr. Nahum Goldmann has, on behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, suggested before the League of Nations Committee of Experts on Refugees Questions that 25,000 Jews from Germany can be settled in various countries, about 12,000, nearly half of them, in Palestine.

Spontaneously, and at first without any contact between them, groups of Territorialists came into existence in Germany, Poland, France, England and America. They got to know of each other, and linked up, and in July 1935 a Conference of the various groups was held in London largely through the efforts of Dr. Joseph Kruk, of Warsaw, and a World Organisation, calling itself the Freeland League for Jewish Territorial Colonisation was formed. The Haham Dr. Moses Gaster, one of the oldest of Zionists, who in the Uganda controversy was one of the leaders of the pro-Palestine side, but who now that the Palestine work is going on successfully, feels keenly the need of more outlets, presided at the Conference, and was elected Honorary President of the Organisation.

I am to-day just as enthusiastic a Zionist as ever I was, and I shall always continue to be that [he declared]. But we must look at the practical side. How big is Palestine ? Even if we accept the talk about room in Transjordan and so forth, which does not meet the present need, the maximum population it can hold is hardly two million. We must remember that two-thirds of these will still be Arabs. What shall we do about the millions of homeless Jews all over the world ? I saw homeless, because their native

countries repudiate them and deny them the rights of natives.

Mr. Leopold Kessler, another old Zionist, like Dr. Gaster a former President of the English Zionist Federation, and the leader of Herzl's expedition to El-Arisch, in the Sinai Peninsula ("Kessler has the knowledge and the repose which are necessary for the task," Herzl wrote of him at the time), became Chairman, Dr. Myer S. Nathan, who was Treasurer of the Ito, resumed his old position, and a number of new men, among them the famous German-Jewish novelist, Dr. Alfred Doebelin, joined the World Committee.

During the Conference, a number of members of both Houses of Parliament, belonging to all Parties, gave the Delegates a luncheon, arranged by Lord Marley, and Mr. Dingle Foot, M.P., Mr. Vyvian Adams, M.P., and Mr. Morgan Jones, M.P., Liberal, Conservative and Labour respectively, which was held in one of the rooms of the House of Commons. Mr. A. Creech-Jones, M.P., Mr. G. Lloyd George, M.P., Miss Eleanor Rathbone, M.P., Mr. James Maxton, M.P., Mr. Fenner Brockway, and others associated themselves with the movement, and a group of enthusiasts, of whom Mr. Herwald, a member of the old Ito Council, Mr. S. J. Woolf and Mr. Maxwell should be specially mentioned, threw themselves into the work. I was in touch with developments from the start, but it was some time before I could decide to come into the organisation.

Lord Marley, who was in the chair at the House of Commons luncheon, said :

This is not an entirely Jewish movement. It is true that we have been impressed by the need for permanent

settlement of the refugees from Germany, who are 80 per cent Jews. We must pay tribute to the marvellous work that has been done in Palestine. Unfortunately, there are about 20,000 refugees left, 80 per cent Jews, whom Palestine cannot accommodate, and we must find a place for them. The German problem is only a small part of the whole problem. We have in Poland a much worse problem. There are over a million people there who are faced with the alternative of economic annihilation or immigration. We in this organisation are seeking a way of enabling these people to leave Poland and to build up a permanent new life in other countries.

Palestine this year was absorbing 50,000 Jews, 20,000 from Germany and 30,000 from other countries, Dr. Lvovitch, one of the leaders of the organisation said. That was a great and important achievement. But unfortunately, the Jewish need is much too great for this important opportunity to be enough. The Jewish question is not only a Jewish question, he went on. For when there is misery in Eastern and Central Europe, it affects not only Jews.

Other speakers included Dr. Doeblin, Mrs. Israel Zangwill, Rabbi Dr. Mattuck, Canon Donaldson and Mrs. Ayrton-Gould, the Chief Woman Officer of the British Labour Party, who remarked that her own grandfather had been a Jewish-Polish refugee, and if he had not had the foresight to leave Poland she would have been one of the three million starving Jews of Poland.

One of the delegates from Poland, Advocate Dr. Tcherniachov, spoke of a meeting which Dr. Nahum Sokolov, the Honorary President of the Zionist World Organisation, had addressed in Vilna, one of the chief Polish cities. The hall, he said, could hold 2,000

people, but the interest was so great that over 50,000 came. It is the same with the desire to get into Palestine, he commented.

Professor Dr. Max Apt, former Director in Chief of the Merchants' Corporation of Berlin, and Curator for many years of the Commercial High School of Berlin, who is one of the leaders of the new Jewish Territorialist movement in Germany, has outlined an expert scheme for an Agrarian and Industrial Bank for Jewish Overseas Settlement. He estimates that in Germany alone 10,000 settlers, about 50,000 souls, could be secured, who would wish to emigrate to countries other than Palestine, and able to settle at their own cost, contributing at least £500 each, a total of over £5,000,000. He proposes that this investment should be administered through the Settlement Bank, shares in which could be taken up also by others than settlers, people and institutions who are interested in promoting the settlement work, as well as by enterprises who would obtain business by supplying the new settlement with machinery and other needs. Thus the development of the area would be financed by outside capital, he writes, and carried on by incoming labour, which would open up an increasing field for internal labour and supplies.

As for Poland, my old and very good friend, Melech Ravitch, a fine Yiddish poet, who was for years the Secretary of the Yiddish Pen Centre, writes in the *Freeland Magazine* in Poland:

There are masses of Jews in the towns and villages of Poland who need bread, and shoes and a roof. But it is impossible for them to work. They have no means to work, and no one can pay for their work. They lose all

incentive. They become discouraged. The whole atmosphere is saturated with depression. Wasted lives. Economics are at the bottom of our lives. People who are dejected and broken in a land full of dejection and broken lives brighten up, become energetic and capable in another place where they find the proper opportunities. Who will deny this? Make a man feel that he is wanted, that his services are needed, and he will strive to give of his best. The touch of the new soil underfoot adds a further stimulus, revivifies. One knows one is in a new land, where there are fresh opportunities. One is out of the rut. Lethargy drops away. The very sight of a bustling city like New York gives hope. Territorialism is as right as a pitcher of water in a desert. The need does not require demonstration. Just produce the water. So you would make of our ideal an emigration society? Why not? Why only one territory? Why not ten? Wherever there are openings for people! Make it possible for those who are not wanted in one place to go where there is need of them, in another, where they can live and do useful work.

It is what Tennyson said: "How dull it is to rust unburnished, not to shine in use!"

There are many parts of the earth that cry out for population [Ravitch goes on]. Mankind may be compared with an old aristocrat who lives in a palace with fifty chambers, lies ill in one of them, and the other forty-nine are left unused. Not long ago I myself travelled through the vast Northern Territory of Australia—thousands of miles of empty land.

Ravitch has taken his own advice, and now lives in Australia, in Melbourne, and in a letter I have received from him, he explains that the monotonous drab sorrow and want in Poland made him feel so depressed that he could not write.

I have come to Australia. Poland nevermore! I shall remain here. I am going to become an Australian citizen.

I shall not return to Poland. How tragic not to want to return to a land that one loves! You have no idea how I love Poland and the Polish Jews, and Warsaw! Yet nevermore, nevermore! I am writing a book now with a stratospheric format—"Continents and Oceans" it is called.

The touch of the new soil underfoot has given him his stimulus, has revived him.

I have quoted what Dr. Gaster said of his continued adhesion to Zionism, while he is working for the new Territorialist movement. Dr. Tcherniachov, also writing in *Freeland*, where Ravitch wrote, says this:

We do not intend to discount in any way the achievements of Zionism. We must state that what the Jews have achieved in Palestine is the greatest achievement of the Jews in the capitalist countries. Our attitude to what has been done in Palestine, especially by the Jewish workers, is without question positive. We base ourselves upon the colonising achievements of Zionism, but considering objectively its possibilities we come to ourselves and to the world with the claim to a free territory for the colonising needs of the Jewish people. We know that a great number of Zionists agree with us in this matter.

Alfred Doeblin, the famous German-Jewish novelist, who is one of the leaders of the new Territorialist movement, has written:

Zionism is a light in the present darkness. Zionism is the will to a complete Jewish existence. What I say, what I avow, is Zionism. If the inner and outer extension of the little country Palestine should really succeed, we would have the final answer to all that oppresses us. The land, the only land of the Patriarchs, is sacred to Jews. But something else, too, is certain. Higher than the land is the people. We must not make a fetish of the land, to bar the road to life to any of the people. Present-day

Zionism divides the Jews into a host of the saved and a host of the damned. The saved are taken to Palestine ; the damned are left behind to rot. It does not do this because it wants to, but that makes no difference. It has no alternative. The host of the saved are only a tenth of the people. Can we approve such judgment ? The nine-tenths must be saved, with or without Palestine.

The small Palestine has for its small mass of people a powerful Organisation, which is maintained by a large part of world-Jewry. Its aim was to change the entire Jewish situation. But so far Zionism has directed its gaze one-sidedly to Palestine. At one time, it was possible. But now the Diaspora comes forward. Hitherto the relation between Zionism and the Diaspora was clear. Apart from the small stream of immigration, the Diaspora was the treasury and the granary. But now the Diaspora has come with its own demands. Is Zionism capable of extending its gaze beyond Palestine ? Can Zionism change its function, and from an Organisation for Palestine, become the Organisation for Jewry ?

The New Territorialism is at work. Here are ideas, plans, aspirations, and the beginnings of an Organisation. And all the objective conditions are here, the vast mass misery, the political pressure, the withdrawal of emancipation.

There is much that Doebelin writes with which I cannot agree. Especially of the " Jewish nation," and of religion and God. He speaks with religious ecstasy, but to me it sounds sheer blasphemy : " A people grows with its God. And with his people God, too, perishes." I know no prouder cry than the Jewish proclamation : " Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is One ! " One God, One universal God, the Eternal, and there is no other, the God of all men. Though Israel perish, which God forbid, God cannot perish, for He is God ! " I am the Lord and there is none else,"

said Isaiah. In terms of modern philosophy, Professor Hermann Cohen said: "The unity of God is not a numerical, a quantitative distinction from the plurality of gods in polytheism, but a qualitative distinction. It means that God is One and Only, in face of the world, which is His creation."

And of the "Jewish nation," Doebelin contends that there is such. But

one must not seek it in the streets of Western Europe, but in Poland, Lithuania, Roumania, where they have not only their religion, but their own language (Yiddish, Hebrew), their own ways and customs, their own newspapers, their own secular literature.

In the streets of Western Europe, though, it seems there is no "Jewish nation." He goes further still: "Eastern Jews can be Jews. Western Jews cannot be Jews." It depends, of course, again on the definition of Jew. Zangwill saw the "Eastern Jews" of whom Doebelin speaks, asking nothing better than to live and die for their native land and to dissolve into the melting-pot of common citizenship, and becoming a "Jewish nation" only "from sheer hopelessness of ever being treated as children of their homeland. Not because they were or wished to be separate, but because they were not allowed to be anything else." Doebelin looks at it differently. He proceeds:

The mass of German, French, English Jews who have cut away from the nationality, are so much German, Frenchmen, Englishmen, that there is for them no Diaspora and flight, but only a home, Germany, France, England. Reason cannot dispute it, only force, which can dispute anything. And this force belongs to the other people, who use it when it suits their purpose.



But Dr. Doebelin and I need not agree in all things to work together for our common purpose. The protocols of the Conference of the Freeland League for Jewish Territorial Colonisation at which Dr. Doebelin read his paper, to which I listened with rapt attention, state that it has "not elaborated a uniform ideology to which all members pledge themselves. The Conference formulated the aims and objects of the movement which are to serve as a guide in its political and practical work."

I prefer to stand with Ravitch: "Make it possible for those who are not wanted in one place to go where there is need of them, in another, where they can live and do useful work." And can become good citizens, I should say, rooted in the new land, only "following their religion and their own aspirations," as Joseph Chamberlain said. "For those Jews who cannot or will not remain in the lands in which they live at present," the Ito programme had it.

In Germany, the movement is growing rapidly, and in Poland it is becoming a mass movement. Not because people are adopting territorialist ideology, but because they are vitally interested in any movement that holds out to them a hope of escape from vegetating, from decaying, of escape to a land where they can employ the faculties God has given them, to earn their bread, and to be useful citizens, whether that land is Palestine, or Argentine, or Canada, or Australia. They would be even more interested in a hope of attaining that end in their own lands, where they are. "It's the appalling waste," says Wells, "The waste of material, the waste of us."

There are several possible settlement projects under

consideration, and there are a number of people interested in the movement who can and would provide capital and experience to help to transfer secondary industries to the new countries. Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd, the Under-Secretary to the Home Department, explained in the House of Commons in March 1936 that

it was estimated that during the past two years, upwards of 200 enterprises, covering a great variety of industries, had been founded in this country by immigrants who had left Germany for racial, religious and other reasons; employment had been given directly to some thousands of British subjects.

Among other projects, there is one for settlement in Ecuador, in South America, which is now being considered by a group of people more or less connected with the new Territorialist movement. The Territorialist movement as such is not, however, officially associated with the negotiations. At its Conference, since the matter had been given publicity in the Press, it declared that the Ecuador project is one of several that require thorough and expert investigation. And a small group of people in Paris and London then formed a special committee to obtain a concession. Under the terms of the concession contract that has since been secured, immigration is open to all persons of the white race coming from Europe, and is not confined to Jews. It is known, however, the responsible committee states, that it is a Jewish body, and the Government will raise no objection if the majority of the immigrants are Jews. There have been some political disturbances in Ecuador recently, and for this and other reasons, chiefly the fact that there has not yet been an expert investigation and survey of

the concession area, the new Territorialist organisation as such is hesitant about the project. It is also uncertain whether there is any possibility there for more than a small-scale agricultural Settlement. The responsible Committee states that the area is situated in the Sierra region of the mountain ranges known as the Cordilleras de los Andes, where the temperature is mild, and the valleys and plains in appearance and vegetation resemble those of Switzerland. Plans for the investigation of the area are now being considered, it adds. I see that Mr. Gruzman, the editor of a Yiddish weekly in Buenos Aires, has been for a month in Ecuador recently, and he states that the possibilities are good. There is also a plan in Berlin and Warsaw to send out an expedition to Brazil, Peru and Venezuela.

A little while ago [Dr. Eder wrote in 1932], I received a letter renewing an offer made to the Ito many years previously of some land in Sao Paulo, Brazil. The offer was a stretch of land 4,000 square miles in extent (half Palestine), at £150 a square mile, about one shilling and threepence a dunam. Wheat and barley, rice, coffee, sugar, potatoes, tomatoes, cauliflowers, cucumbers, oranges and apples were all cultivated; cattle on the grass-lands and fish in the many rivers, an abundance of timber, of water; whatever a pioneer dreamed of to be had in this favoured country. This was no auctioneer's fable; the stories were all true. There was only one thing lacking—the land was not in Palestine.

Mr. Herwald has also shown me an offer made in 1912 through him to the Ito by the Government of Honduras for a settlement concession of considerable size.

There is a good deal of uncoordinated activity, born of the need of the time. It is a mass movement that with a definite goal in sight to which all these efforts could be jointly directed could be utilised to the im-

mense benefit of not only the people seeking outlets and opportunity, but also of the countries that would receive their devoted labour and gratitude.

Most of those in the new Territorialist organisation would by far prefer settlement possibilities under the British flag. Zangwill expressed the feeling when he wrote: "For centuries England has been the political hope of the Jew—indeed, the Holy Land of Europe, the cradle of liberty, the fount of salvation," and "the thought of England lives and glows in the hearts of the oppressed—as the sun of liberty, the ark of refuge." There is, too, a growing realisation that it is not so much agricultural labour that is now needed, as the development of secondary industries. A message from Adelaide, for example, emphasises the fact that few farms in Australia are now able to pay their way without subsidies. And it goes on to say that

Migration in a new guise, that of transplanted secondary industries is alone likely to be acceptable. Even then, Melbourne and Sydney will demand assurances that they will be in lines of manufacture not competing with existing industries. Adelaide is the warmest supporter of the plan, for it badly needs more industries.

Mr. Stevens, the Premier of New South Wales, made a statement in February 1936, in which he said :

I have carefully reviewed our position in recent months and am confident that with the right proportion of labour and capital from overseas we could go forward in a big way to the advantage of both Britain and Australia. Provided that our financial policy is directed to meet the expanding demands of industry our unemployed, except in the depressed mining areas, can be substantially absorbed in private industry within a year or so. We have to think internationally and Imperially. Never again will six

million people have an opportunity of sharing the destiny of a continent.

The easiest and better favoured sites are always the first to be settled, and it is due more to force of circumstances than to any defection by the Australian nation that the central and north-western lands are still so sparsely peopled [the Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph Cook, who was High Commissioner for Australia, has written]. To develop this area is a great undertaking. It is a land of promise, but one difficult to bring to the point of performance. Australia is firm in its intention to hold the bulk of its treasures intact and jealously protect them. The instinct of the Australian that this is white-man's country, as well as the temperate zones in which he now mainly dwells, is sound. Those who know the country best are firmest in their adhesion to the White Australia policy.

Australia's empty interior and its sparsely peopled north may yet become the sphere of some of the country's most important activities.

Zangwill has said that Sir Alfred Deakin once suggested to the Ito the Northern Territory of Australia for Jewish settlement, but at that time it was not considered desirable—"a derelict, tropical desert," he called it. Might it not be, as Sir Joseph Cook declared, "a land of promise, but one difficult to bring to the point of performance?" And if it is, did not Zangwill say: "Were men to be deterred by difficulties there would be an end to the taming of our planet?" And also, so far as "the hardships and the need to work with greater patience are concerned," "nor has it ever been the Ito's view that our colonists are to enjoy either a feather-bed or a fire-proof existence."

Mr. Patkin, of Melbourne, in his article in the *Freie Shriften*, warns against any idea of colonising Jewish immigrants in the Northern Territory. To his

mind, it would be misleading poor people, worn out by suffering and anxious to go anywhere in order to get a chance to work, because "it is a mirage, without any real practical prospect." Mr. Ravitch, also of Melbourne, who has travelled through the Northern Territory, declares on the other hand, that what he has seen convinces him that it warrants investigation by an expert commission. "The hardships of Jewish life in Poland," whence Mr. Ravitch has recently come, "are greater than the difficulties to be overcome in the Northern Territory."

It is a matter that must be carefully investigated. However difficult the position in Poland, it would be criminally irresponsible to raise hopes among these people of a large territory available for development, and afterwards have to abandon it, or worse still, have people go out there, and be stranded, to perish under hopeless conditions, in a strange continent. But it would be equally irresponsible, both to the people who need the land, and to the land that if it is capable of development should not be left deserted and neglected, to do nothing further towards discovering what are the facts. Mr. George Sutherland, in his history of South Australian colonisation relates that when the Company wanted to sell land in South Australia at the fixed price of twelve shillings per acre, they could find no buyers, because the area had not been sufficiently explored.

"Why don't you have the land surveyed?" someone asked and, no doubt, very naturally [he writes]. "It is all very well to ask us to buy; but you yourselves admit that the place is an unexplored wilderness, and it may, for aught we know to the contrary, be a perfect Sahara." "You are trying to start another South Sea Bubble," was the remark with which their advances were sometimes met

as they laid the details of the scheme before the business men of the City of London. The public said in effect, "We won't buy land until we have a survey, or at least an exploration," and thus the whole matter had reached the stage of absolute deadlock.

Worse still, Dr. W. H. Leigh, who had been there, published a book on *Adventures in the New Colonies of South Australia* calculated to leave on the mind of the reader the utterly unwarrantable impression that the new colony, instead of being the "Land of Promise" that it had been represented to be, was "a desert unfitted for the maintenance even of savages, to say nothing of civilised human beings." Yet not many years later, there was the prosperous city of Adelaide, with about 10,000 inhabitants (and to-day nearly 200,000), and Mr. Sutherland was writing in 1898, "Men who, sixteen or eighteen years ago bought city acres for £2,000 or £3,000 apiece have, in the interval, paid as much as that in rates and taxes." For there was the Adelaide land boom of 1881-2.

It does not follow that the experience of South Australia will be repeated even in part of the Northern Territory. It may be, as Zangwill said years ago, and Mr. Patkin and others believe now, "a derelict, tropical desert." But quite recently Professor Stephen H. Roberts, of Melbourne University, in his book, *History of Australian Land Settlement*, writes of the Northern Territory :

This vast tract of 355 million acres was always a tantalising land, subject to conflicting reports, for nobody knew how much truth there was to the theory that the Northern Territory was merely the "dead heart" of Australia. Gradually, however, it was realised that vitally different

Above all, there was the luxurious grass country from the coast to the foot of the ranges, and competent observers have declared that this land of the western rivers is probably the best watered portion of the Australian continent.

And also :

In the 'eighties, attention was directed to a peculiarity of Australian physiography—that Australia possessed a supply of underground water probably the most extensive in the world. Russell, the Government astronomer of New South Wales in 1879 predicted that "an unlimited supply of good water" would be found under the surface, and this was soon justified, for within a year (in 1880) water was tapped at Killare Run. There was subsequently a boom in this regard in the early '80s, but interest waned when less than 15 per cent of the bores were successful. To date, however, there are 5,170 bores in Australia, three-quarters of which are in Queensland. The most beautiful results have been obtained in the dry pastoral country, especially in the north-west of New South Wales and in the Northern Territory. Further north, in Australia's "dead heart," an extension of bores will undoubtedly add to the pastoral resources of the Commonwealth.

Australia is but on the threshold. Extension of settlement depends on financial provision for irrigation and conservation, rather than rainfall.

Just over half a century ago, speaking at Birmingham in January 1885, Joseph Chamberlain said :

It does not need a prophet to predict that in the course of the next half century, the Australian Colonies will have attained such a position that no Power will be strong enough to ignore them, and that they will have a supreme authority in the Pacific Seas.

And also he wrote :

The future of the Empire lies henceforward not in its power to annex new territories, but in its capacity to unite existing dominions and develop existing resources. We have been, on the whole, wonderfully fortunate, but we



cannot trust for ever to good luck. Our development has hardly begun.

More than forty years later, in 1927, one of his successors as Colonial Secretary, Mr. Amery, his disciple and a Minister in his own tradition, declared in an official speech delivered in Australia: "How immense is the task of development before Australia, and important as are the adjustments that have to be made continually in the social structure, that social structure itself depends upon what Australians can do to wrest from Nature her resources, by their organisation, by their science, by their skill and by their hard work. With you the resources of your home market are limited by a small population, your resources in primary production are almost unlimited in one sense, and yet limited all the time by a consideration of your home market, and therefore of your primary production, and by the problem of immigration and settlement. Only the large-scale industries can to-day produce really cheaply. From the economic point of view, at any rate, I can see no limit to the material expansion which can take place in the British Empire in the next generation or two, if our various peoples were once seized, as the Americans have been seized, with the idea of the development of their territory—the conception of what we could do to help each other to develop it.

There is, I know, a very natural temptation, in a great sunny continent like Australia, towards a detached, self-complacent, selfish conception of national life. And yet I believe in the fellowship of the British Empire, with the appeal which it makes to each of its members to think not only of its own national life, but of a wider common interest,

a wider responsibility, first of all within the Empire, but also through the Empire towards the world at large.

Australia is responsible, as trustee for the whole Empire, for the not least rich, not the least sparsely populated, and certainly not as yet the most fully developed of these estates. You have here a wonderful continent, of wonderful resources and infinite possibilities—a continent in which work has been achieved, remarkable in itself and a great tribute to the ability and enterprise of the handful of people who have done it, but on the other hand, very small in its sum-total with the vast amount of work yet to be done.

To say that you ought to bring in no new immigrants as long as you have any unemployed on your books—well, it is almost as absurd as saying that you ought to allow no children to be born anywhere as long as there are any unemployed on the earth. What is needed to avoid unemployment is to make sure that the men you bring in are going direct to productive employment and are going to stay there, and that you do not dump them promiscuously with no provision for what they are going to do afterwards. Well-conducted immigration, so far from increasing unemployment, is indeed the only effective cure for it in a country like Australia.

In the long run, no community can consume more of the world's goods than it produces. If it produces efficiently and in abundance, it will have abundance of wealth. If you want to enlarge and strengthen your home market, you must secure a larger population within your own country. I think that point is an important one as affecting the whole attitude towards the question of immigration. There is, I think, a tendency, not unnatural perhaps, to regard the immigrant as a competitor in the labour world. But the true point of view, I would suggest, is that any newcomer who finds productive work is a new employer. As a purchaser, as a consumer, he necessarily becomes an employer of the labour of the rest of his fellow-citizens, a contributor to the volume of employment and a supporter of the standard of living of the community.

The angle from which I think all Australian problems should be approached is, not that of the position of Australia

to-day - but of Australia as she might become, as she ought to become, and as I think she must become. Here, on this ever-contracting planet lies this great Island Continent, with its immense undeveloped resources. You have a great destiny to fulfil. If you have decided to keep this continent for your own race, I cannot imagine that you have done so merely from a negative point of view, from the same attitude of mind that has inspired the priests of Tibet to keep their mountain fastnesses in seclusion to themselves. Behind foreign policy and defence there lies the material basis for these things—economic development, wealth, efficiency, in a word, man-power.

Now, in March 1936, Mr. Lyons, the Australian Commonwealth Prime Minister, has

delivered a speech which sharply calls the Australian people to realities. Defence means men ; Australians, Mr. Lyons declared, can no longer refuse both to have children themselves and to welcome families from overseas. Australia is at last aware of itself as an empty continent in a land-hungry world.

But Australia is not alone. Exactly a year after he had spoken in Australia, in January 1928, Mr. Amery was paying an official visit as Colonial Secretary to Canada. And in an address delivered at Vancouver, he said :

You have vast and only partially-developed territories which are capable of sustaining a great white civilisation, climatically suited to the development of our people and of our institutions. Taking that element of the Empire alone—an element you have in Canada, in the great island continent of Australia, in New Zealand and in the great sub-continent of South Africa, an area two and a half times as large as the United States, and with resources, undeveloped, dormant, fully two and a half times as great. When we come to the question of what we have done to develop those resources, then I think we must frankly

admit that we have been left behind to a large extent by our neighbours. The United States, in the last generation or two, have developed the resources of their great territory to a point which makes them to-day, as you here in Canada know so well, the greatest economic force in the world. They have more railways than all the world together; they consume in industry more horse-power, whether steam or electric or oil-driven, than the rest of the world. They have four times as many motor-cars as the rest of the world. They have built up an amazing fabric of economic power. We, it seems to me, have worked far too much in watertight compartments, each thinking only of our immediate local problem. The last generation has been undoubtedly—from the trade point of view—the generation of the United States. I believe that the coming generation, if we realise our opportunities, if we realise the assets we have to develop, if we have confidence in our ability, is going to be the generation of the British Empire.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Daily Telegraph*, May 13, 1936:—

"The suggestion that if Britain does not develop her Dominions the people of other lands may do so was made at a meeting of the Royal Empire Society last night, when Mr. B. S. B. Stevens, Premier of New South Wales, initiated a discussion of overseas settlement. Mr. Stevens said that there was still great scope for development in Australia, not only for Australian and British people, but for the whole world.

"Lord Bledisloe, a former Governor-General of New Zealand, said that Mr. Stevens had referred rather mysteriously to the territorial ambitions of other countries and in a memorandum which he had circulated among the speakers he had said: 'This may be the last opportunity that an English-speaking people will have of building up a British Australia.' Lord Bledisloe added that he had come from New Zealand with the conviction that the country needed a great increase in population by people from British sources, and that as soon as possible."

"The Dominion of Canada is now making steady and substantial progress towards recovery," says the new Annual Report of The Canada Life Assurance Company, sent me as a policy-holder. "Its government is stable, exports are expanding, its Revenue is increasing and its unemployment is becoming much less acute. Its vast natural resources are unsurpassed by those of any other country, and the need which the world will have for them ensures for it a future of prosperity with which few countries, if any, will be able to compare."

## CHAPTER X

### THE SHAPES ARISE

THERE are now in Australia, according to the *Jewish Year Book*, about 27,000 Jews, out of the total population of 6,630,000 ; and in Canada there are 155,600 Jews in a total population of 10,376,000. In the United States, with 4,228,000 Jews out of the total population of 123,000,000, the percentage of Jews, after a Jewish immigration of 2,335,000 from 1881 to 1933, is only 2·76 per cent—little more than the Jewish percentage in the world as a whole, which is 2·05 per cent. In some countries, like all Central and South America combined, it is no more than ·39 per cent.

Over forty years ago, when the Jewish population of the East End of London was still unassimilated, most of them new arrivals from Russia, and mainly engaged in the beginnings of what has now become the important ready-made clothing industry (which is equally important in Leeds and other places), Mrs. Sidney Webb, writing in Charles Booth's *Life and Labour of the People in London*, after describing their adjustment problems, said that " the present condition of the East End Jewish tailor may be fairly stated as 'mentally and physically progressive.' If they alone were concerned, no enquiry would be needed." The Jewish immigrants also helped to develop the shoe-

making, leather-bag making, cap making, fur trades, furniture making and the tobacco industry, which "from 1881 onwards have been on the increase, both numerically and by percentage."

It is sometimes recognised [Charles Booth wrote at the time] that the Jews have acted as "moral scavengers," for it is undoubtedly true that the Jews "improve the character of the worst streets when they get in." We need not fear to admit the Jews [he went on]. They do not increase the pressure of poverty, nor do they permanently lower the standard of living.

*The New Survey of London Life and Labour* which was published in 1932, as the successor to Booth's work, supports, with the experience of forty years behind it, this view expressed by Booth. Speaking of "the present position of the Jewish Community in East London, to which forty years ago many of the evils of 'sweating' and poverty were attributed," it declares that

it is evident that "sweating" in the sense used in Charles Booth's *Survey* has ceased to be a "major cause" of poverty in East London. The appalling squalor in Charles Booth's time has been wellnigh swept away by wholesale demolitions and rebuilding, and (it is fair to add) by the displacement of the unsavoury class of poor gentiles by Jews. As the Jews have Anglicised, the standard of life among them rises. There has been a decline of poverty generally.

The unsavoury class of poor gentiles referred to are "the professional cadgers, dock-loungers and the like, who would work at no price, a semi-criminal class." They have decreased enormously in number. And in the same way, the number of homeless poor, "moral, physical and economic dregs which filter down from

all the grades above them," has become "very small, about one-half per cent of the total population."

The transformation that has occurred in many Whitechapel streets since the war is evidence of the higher standard of living attained by the inhabitants, compared with forty or even twenty years ago. The Jewish population of London will, within a short period, be almost without exception English-born. It is in the wide dispersion of the Jewish population of East London to trades outside the range and capacity of the immigrants of the '80s and '90s that the new outlook engendered by English education is most clearly discerned.

Major Herbert Evans, who was for many years a Home Office Inspector under the Factory and Workshop Acts, and had unrivalled experience of the East End of London during the terrible sweating period which made Whitechapel a by-word throughout the world, published his reminiscences in 1930, and his very first paragraph is a tribute to the wonderful work which the Jewish immigrant has done in transforming Whitechapel into what, granted all its faults, it has become to-day. Thirty-five years ago, only a little before the beginning of the present century, he writes, a visitor to Whitechapel approached that place with an irrepressible feeling of terror, heightened by mystery. It had become a place of noisome alleys. It was a festering sore on the fair face of the rest of London, a place which harboured downs and outs, criminals, house-breakers, sneak-thieves, spongers, public-house loungers, murderers, and worse. One of the few green spaces still retains to the generation not yet so old the name of "Itchy Park" because of its one-time vermin-ridden frequenters. The middle-aged inhabit-

ants of Whitechapel and former Whitechapel dwellers, who now live in more exalted places, still remember some of the then by Jews yet unpenetrated parts of Whitechapel, where this description still applied only thirty or even twenty-five years ago, streets down which no Jew, and no decently-clad non-Jew either, dare venture. The memory of the Jack-the-Ripper crimes still reeked in the place, and the author of *Child-Slaves of Britain* declared that one could "peer down gulleys where murder is bred."

The Jewish immigrant came, and gradually public houses gave way to grocery stores and workshops. The newcomers were not criminals; they were not louts; they were not the dregs of the nation and the lowest of the Irish immigrant class, but their reputation was at first hardly less unsavoury than that of those whom they replaced. Stories of overcrowding, of several families in one room, of under-payment of workers, of sweating conditions, found their way into the press, and Whitechapel became a new place of terror, the home of the sweatshop system. Overcrowding and disease became synonymous with Whitechapel. Gradually assimilation set in. The Whitechapel Jew became less an alien and more a citizen. The sweatshop was strangled out of existence by the rising Jewish trade union movement and a new wind began to blow down the mean and dingy streets of Whitechapel. Shops began to improve their appearance. The shop-fronts were rebuilt like those of the West-end stores and the window-dressing was not far behind them. The streets were cleaned and broadened, and to-day Major Evans writes: "Whitechapel is no longer a slum, a place of slum dwellers, and the sweat-



shop is no longer taking its toll of adult and child health and life."

The social life of the Jew [Major Evans writes] was from the start wholly different from, and much superior to, that of the Whitechapel Christian, and in the industrial outlook his faith was fixed on concentration and he brought sobriety and frugality which revolutionised local life.

It is true, and yet the Jew is not so terribly superior. Judged by ordinary standards, he is just an ordinary human being, who, in the lump, doesn't "look too good or talk too wise." And despite a lot of loose talk by antisemites or separatist Jews, he is a good mixer. Zangwill quotes Sir Stuart Samuel, a former President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, who went on an official mission to Poland, saying that in many parts the Jews had so assimilated to the surroundings that he found it hard to distinguish them from the rest of the population. The alien parents have always taken the greatest care that their children should attend the public schools of the country and identify themselves in sympathy and feeling with their English neighbours, writes H. S. Q. Henriques, K.C., Sir Stuart Samuel's successor as President of the Board. The trouble is rather that the Jew is too good a mixer, when he gets the chance. Mr. Henriques found, as others have found, that "one of our great difficulties has been to reconcile this assimilation to the general population with the continuance of Jewish religious customs." But "the experience of the long-established portion of the British Community is that they have been able to combine the characters of true sons of Israel and loyal citizens of Great Britain." There is also the "considerable movement of dispersion," noted

in the new London Survey. So that there is no longer the old congestion of the Jewish quarter. I live in Highgate, where there are few Jews. But I passed recently through Brondesbury and Willesden (a rare excursion) on my way to a funeral at the Willesden Jewish cemetery, that of Zangwill's eldest sister, as it happens. The districts are reputed to be the centres of the new Jewish settlement, but I was struck by the absence of any specific Jewish character, such as was obvious in Whitechapel. The Jews were hardly in evidence, and most people I saw in the streets (it was Palm Sunday) were wearing palm crosses. Life has adjusted itself smoothly.

All in all, the Jewish immigrants have been absorbed into the economic and social life of London, as of all other places, with no harmful, but rather beneficial effects to their place of settlement. There has been a general improvement of conditions in the areas they inhabit, not only of themselves, but also of that non-Jewish population which lives among them or neighbours on them. And they have become an integral part of the life of the country. About 75 per cent of the population of Stepney, for example, which forty years ago was largely foreign, are now London born, and only 17 per cent were born abroad.

Many of the men and women who now occupy honoured positions in the life of the country are the children and grandchildren of immigrants. Mrs. Ayrton-Gould is only one of many whose grandfathers were Jewish-Polish refugees.

In America, Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard, the editor of the *New York Nation*, is himself the son of a penniless immigrant, not Jewish, who, he relates,

worked in restaurants, at every kind of manual labour, in order to keep body and soul together, while he learnt the language. He became the friend of Abraham Lincoln, and twenty-five years later he opened the first Pacific railways through the Northern and Western States. James H. Hill, another pioneer of North-western railroading, declared that had it not been for him, "the West would not have been opened up for another twenty years, during which that great country would have lain dormant and untouched."

So there you have the contribution to America [writes Mr. Villard] of one friendless immigrant without means, without the language. I am not telling you this out of family pride, but to illustrate what some of the immigrants have contributed to this country. I never hear of young immigrants being kept out of this country without wondering whether there are not among them many others who carry in their knapsacks the baton of a captain of industry.

And of the loyalty of the immigrants to their new land, Mr. Villard has this striking remark :

Many of us who are born to our Americanism accept it as we do the winds and the sun and the rain, without appreciation, without understanding, without even gratitude. The great multitudes of the foreign-born deeply cherished this country, which seemed to them to embody their dreams of a political paradise on earth.

On the Liberty Monument that stands at the approach to New York Harbour, there is engraved a poem by an American Jewess, Emma Lazarus, in which she cries :

Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning  
to breathe free ;  
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me.

There are always, of course, people whose philosophy of life is that of the wanderer's hymn :

"Break free from your moorings," sayeth the Lord.  
"I have no love for those that get stuck in harbour.  
They make me shudder, they that rot in the stench of their  
indolence.

I gave man legs to carry him across the earth,  
And feet that he may run,  
And not stop still, like a tree in his roots."

And there are others to whom all earth is the same,  
who echo Goethe :

God's is the Orient, God's is the Occident,  
North and South lands  
Rest in the peace of His hands.

There are such among Jews, too, both adventurers  
and restless roving wanderers, as well as cosmopolitans,  
to whom all earth is the same, though usually, that  
is not because they believe that all lands rest in the  
peace of God's hands. But for most of us :

God gave all men all earth to love,  
But since our hearts are small,  
Ordained for each one spot should prove  
Beloved over all.

And Joseph Jacobs placed it on record that though  
"the adventurous pioneer seeking new lands from the  
desire to conquer obstacles and live a life untrammelled  
by the conventions of society," is found "among the  
leaders of Jewish settlement," he is less frequent "than  
the hardened victim of persecution, broken in almost  
everything but spirit and energy—in search of the  
opportunity merely to live in unmolested exercise of  
his faith."

Rabbi Steinberg, in his book on *The Modern Jew*,  
remarks,

This entire chapter has been devoted to abnormalities.  
It has been a record of the pathology of the Jewish psyche.

Nothing has been said concerning that vast majority of Jews who are simple, decent human beings, happily balanced, despite the fact that they are Jews. The existence of such large numbers of the well-adjusted calls for no special explanation.

But it should not be obscured and forgotten because of the disproportionate attention given to the unadjusted and the abnormal.

The great mass of Jews are not successful businessmen or financiers or professional people and intellectuals. They are quiet, sober-living people, who make no success of life in the accepted sense, who amass no wealth and seek no wealth, who do not weigh and measure their service and demand "glittering prizes." They go unobtrusively about their daily task, hundreds upon hundreds of them, "nameless, poor," not exactly "unlettered," but not excessively so, content to do their duty in life without making demands on it, undiscouraged by reverses and all in all doggedly helping to build up a totality of life that is in its humble way intensely important to the well-being of the world. They are "Mah Yafith" Jews in a sense of which I am not ashamed, for does not the "Mah Yafith" hymn read :

If you have no wine, then say :  
On our bread Thy grace we pray.

It sounds common sense to me. My own father was of that artisan type, and his group of friends likewise, so that in his home I learned to know this honest, hard-working, unambitious Jew, unambitious in all except to live a decent life and to do nothing of which he and his need be ashamed. Altogether, I should say that he outnumbers by far the assertive "successful Jews,"

who because of their assertiveness and their "success" secure publicity and seem to impress the public mind as if they were all the Jews there are. The great mass of Jews are ordinary, simple people, who have no other desire than to do their work, humbly, thankful for their daily bread and the common things of life, and anxious to be left in peace, and allowed to fit in, happiest when they feel they have pulled a little more than their weight.

Jews have been mainly workers, small artisans. In Babylon they were weavers. So they were in Alexandria. In Syria, too, where they were also renowned as dyers. In ancient times there were Jewish shoemakers, bakers, glass-blowers, ironsmiths, gold and bronze workers. In the synagogue in Alexandria there were special places for blacksmiths, nailsmiths, gold and silversmiths. There were in the earliest days of the Diaspora Jewish Artisans' Guilds. In Italy, Spain, France, Germany, the Jews were tanners, shoemakers, saddlers, cutlers, jewellers, potters. In Poland and Lithuania and Russia there were from the fourteenth century important Jewish artisans' guilds. The great mass of the Jewish populations of these countries up to modern times were artisans. In Soviet Russia they were to a large extent declassed, because they were not prolétarians, but independent artisans, sometimes employing one or two assistants and apprentices. But the system of artisan co-operatives has largely overcome this difficulty. In Poland, Lithuania, Bohemia, Roumania the Jewish artisan class is still among the largest in point of numbers. They are generally home-workers, as distinct from factory-workers, and in the East European countries the rise of the factory system

came at a time when Jews found it difficult to obtain admission, even to factories belonging to Jewish industrialists. In the big Polish textile centres of Lodz and Bialystock, for instance, the Jewish weavers, who were the pioneers of the industry, are still home-workers, and cannot secure the opportunity to work the machine-loom, though most of the mills are owned by Jews, because of the pressure of non-Jewish workers who want employment. In Russia, great numbers of Jews have now become factory-workers, and are also employed in the coal-mines of Donetz and in the huge metallurgical and electrical plants of the country. In Holland and Belgium the great majority of the Jewish population are workers in the diamond-cutting industry. In France and England the mass of the Jewish population are workers in the tailoring, shoe-making, cabinet-making, fur and similar industries. About 11,000 Jewish artisans are engaged in the clothing industry in Paris. In London, Leeds, and Manchester, the Jewish tailoring workers have been from the beginning of the big immigration movement of the '80s and '90s, the greater proportion of the Jewish population, and though to-day the field of choice is much wider and there are not so many Jews concentrated in tailoring, the largest number of Jews in England are still workers and artisans, and far from rich. Sir H. Llewellyn Smith, the editor of the new London Survey, writes: "The Jewish community in East London is still on the whole a poor community," though not "a serious factor in the causation of East London poverty," and the Survey draws attention elsewhere to "the transformation that has occurred in many Whitechapel streets since the war" as "evi-

dence of the higher standard of living attained by the inhabitants compared with forty or even twenty years ago." "Jews and Gentiles had shared in the general improvement," said Miss Hannah Cohen, the President of the Jewish Board of Guardians in London, commenting on the new London Survey at the time it appeared, in March 1934. And she, too, emphasised that "it was an important fact, and one far too little realised, that the Jewish working-class community in London is still on the whole a poor community." At the same time, "there was evidence of a vast diminution of poverty in its severest form, and there had been an undoubted rise in the level of physical well-being, and an all-round improvement in the standards of life." In New York there has been a decline similar to that in England in the number of Jews in the tailoring industry. In 1918 the Jews were still 86 per cent of all members of the tailoring trade unions. By 1924, the number had decreased to 63 per cent. There has been no fall in the number of organised Jewish workers. They have gone into other branches of industry. The number of organised Jewish workers in the United States is about 350,000. There are about 150,000 tailors among these, 10,000 building-trade workers, 10,000 cabinet makers and carpenters, 4,000 bakers, and, incidentally, over 100,000 artisans, home-workers. In 1900, 79 per cent of all Jewish workers in New York were engaged in tailoring. To-day, the proportion is under 70 per cent. And 50 per cent of all the building-trade workers in New York are Jews. In Palestine, the overwhelming majority of the Jewish inhabitants are workers and artisans and agricultural workers. There are about 7,000 Jewish building



workers in Palestine. In Tel Aviv alone there are about 2,000 artisans, most of them engaged in tailoring and shoe-making. The Jewish Labour Federation is the largest and most powerful organisation in Palestine.

Even in the Middle Ages, when the Jew was supposed to be rich because he largely dealt with money, Sir Lionel Abrahams pointed out that he only seemed to be, because he could not have any other property, and all he possessed was in coin. Other people rarely had money. Citing an ancient document of enquiry into the movables possessed by the inhabitants of Colchester in 1301, Sir Lionel showed that of the 390 inhabitants examined, only ten were found to possess any money, and the largest sum found was two marks (£1 6s. 8d.). Similarly, tenants paid the lord of the manor mainly in work, cows or poultry. The nobleman's wealth being in lands or villeins, or the merchant's in goods or ships, was not fluid. It was thus people had to "go to the Jews" in any crisis demanding metallic money, or securities for money, though for example even Shylock's wealth in ducats was probably inferior to Antonio's in argosies. Hence the delusion from which the world still suffers. "Jews have attained as a whole comparatively little in the way of financial and economic eminence," was Sir Lionel's contention.

There are, of course, conspicuous exceptions, but in the main the Jew is everywhere a poor, hard-working, straightforward, industrious, ordinary human being, glad if he can get work to do, and travelling to the ends of the earth, if need be, to get it, when conditions at home make it impossible. He is even ready to go pioneering in the untamed parts of the earth, and often

proves to be of good hardy stock. Mr. Stanley Bero has told the story of some Jews who came in the early pioneering days to Engleheart, in Northern Ontario, who

mined and felled trees, played poker and drank hard liquor with the rest. They also prayed twice daily, and on the Sabbath many more attended the services. But no one cared to know whether they were Jews. They were part of the whole. They had come with the other thousands, to wrestle with the elements and chance. They had come from Russia, Galicia, Roumania. They had come with nothing at all, fresh immigrants to Toronto or Montreal who had trekked north in their search of fortune. They stayed and saw things through. At the time of the first rush their houses were overcrowded with people of all races and types, men who worked for stakes high and low, unfortunates who lost their all, and lucky devils who grew rich overnight. Lumber became the backbone of Engleheart industry and made the town an important railroad centre. A cement plant was started and a brickyard was being planned. A Jewish bakery was running full blast, turning out German, Bohemian, French, Irish and Italian bread, that all its customers might be pleased. The railroad was extended, gradually reaching out to the neighbourhood of Hudson Bay. Here and there the route was dotted with townlets, each with its tiny quota of Jews who seemed happy up there in the wilds. A Jewish assayer, Moses Jacobs, travelled from mining camp to mining camp with the heavy satchel that contained his laboratory. In those icy regions, where tears would rise to snow-dazzled eyes and lips and cheeks would turn blue with cold, Jews, too, pitched their tents. There, where rolling stones learn to take root, Jews held their own. Long before the railway crossed Canada's virgin stretches, long before the government roads were cut, Jewish feet led the way, stumbling sometimes but treading onward always. There were seventy Jewish families in Engleheart and as many in Cobalt in 1908. The railroad bed had hardened, the rails

were firmly set. Jewish muscle had contributed its share to the laying of the smooth track. Trains ran but seldom, but handcars could be obtained at the station. Many other Jews came after that, mostly for work in the lumber camps. Five cents for every tree felled was a high price, but some of these lumberjacks earned as much as three dollars a day. Few of them, however, became permanent settlers in the north; the nature of the work and the primitive conditions under which they had to live were such as to discourage the weak and to hold only the strong. Those who remained were men of grit, hard as steel and endowed with the simple faith of children. Roughly one-fourth of those who had followed the call of the soil remained to till the land.

There was a Jew named Henry Joseph, who came from England, who is said to have run the first ships to ply the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence river. One of the first railway lines in British Columbia, an important section of the Cariboo road, was built through the efforts of Charles Oppenheimer. He and his brother, Isaac Oppenheimer, also took a leading part in the incorporation of Vancouver, and in the negotiations for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway line. They also constructed an electric railway between Vancouver and Westminster. The industrial development in general of Vancouver and British Columbia was, in part, due to Charles and Isaac Oppenheimer. About 1760 Samuel Judah and Aaron Hart settled in Three Rivers and engaged in extensive fur trading with England. Hart had been an officer on the staff of Field-Marshal Lord Amherst's army that simultaneously with Wolfe's capture of Quebec took Montreal. He afterwards became seignior of Becancour. Sir Mortimer Davis (of tobacco fame),

Mr. Jacob A. Jacobs, Mr. Mark Workman and others did pioneering in asbestos, coal and iron mining in Canada. But it is not these great names or in Australia the great names of Sir John Monash and of Sir Isaac Isaacs, the retiring Governor-General, that impress me as much as the hardy Jewish settlers, the workers, farmers and miners, the unknown, the men of the people. There is a story in one of the issues of the *Bnai Brith Magazine* about some Jews from Kiev, in the Ukraine, who formed a colony out in Colorado, working in the Saltiel silver mines, employed on the building of the Rio Grande Railway across the Royal Gorge. Afterwards they took to farming. Mr. Gabriel Davidson, the General Manager of the Jewish Agricultural Society of America, states that there are 100,000 Jewish farmers in the United States, owning 1,500,000 acres in all the forty-eight States of the Union. Thirty-six years ago, when the Society was founded, in 1900, there were only 216 Jewish farm families in the United States, owning 12,029 acres of land. These men, this type of hard-working Jew, are immigrants, and their like may be found to-day in Poland, Lithuania, Roumania, Carpatho-Russia, Germany, ready to do likewise, if they are given a chance.

They can even on occasion throw up a real rugged fighter. John Brown, whose soul goes marching on, had several Jewish settlers in his Company of Deliverers in Kansas territory, and one of them was "my friend Bondi," an immigrant from Austria, who, after fighting at the age of fifteen in the 1848 Revolution, crossed to America and went West. He fought through the Civil War with a notable record, and died as Judge Bondi in 1907. And Rabbi Martin Zielonka of El

Pasos, Texas, tells the story of Sam Dreben, an immigrant from Russia, who fought in Mexico, in Honduras and in France, where he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Medaille Militaire and Croix de Guerre with palms as well as other decorations from Belgium and Italy. General Pershing called him "one of my finest and bravest soldiers," and when he died in 1925 the El Paso *Herald* said :

Here's to Sam Dreben ; Jewish immigrant, of old world peasant stock, a fine upstanding American who loved the United States with a passionate devotion of which many of us are incapable ; an honourable man, a loyal friend, a gallant soldier—all honour to his memory, peace to his ashes, eternal happiness to his soul !

The El Paso *Times* :

It is with some bitterness that one realises that had the "alien laws" now in force in this country been in effect when Sam Dreben reached our shores, he would have been barred. We would have had no place for the immigrant boy who proved one of the greatest heroes of the American Army.

It is less astonishing perhaps to learn from Stanley Bero that Tex Austin, the Rodeo man, who punched cows and herded beef for twenty-five years, is a Jew, whose people, "good, observing Jews of the old school," Tex calls them, lived in South Carolina. It is not even necessary for the Drebens to leave their homelands to prove themselves. There is Trumpeldor, who afterwards became the hero of Jewish Palestine, who died defending Tel Hai.

He was born in the Caucasus in 1880 [Jabotinsky writes of him]. His father was one of those men of iron endurance who went through the hell of Nicholas the First's barracks

—twenty-five years. Trumpeldor was not allowed into the University because he was a Jew. He became a dentist. Then came the Russo-Japanese War. His Regiment was sent to Port Arthur, and there he endured eleven months of siege. He lost his left arm, almost to the shoulder. But no sooner was he out of hospital than he demanded to be sent back to the front. After the fall of Port Arthur he was taken prisoner by the Japanese, with the rest of General Stoessel's army. After the war he was raised to the rank of officer, and he was awarded the St. George's Cross four times, twice in gold and twice in bronze. Until 1917, he was, as far as I know, the only Jewish officer in the Russian army. In Palestine, all his comrades agree that with his one arm he was the strongest and best of the agricultural workers. He looked like an Englishman or a Swede.

"The bravest man I know," Colonel Patterson, his commanding officer, said of him.

I have no desire to be either apologetic or boastful about the qualities and the services of the immigrant, and particularly the immigrant Jew, to the country which gives him political freedom and economic opportunity. I am myself an immigrant, brought to England as a child by my immigrant parents. Mr. Gatenby, who was the headmaster of the Whitechapel school I attended, and whom I to-day number among my many friends, found it an odd alien world to which he was transferred in order to teach us English ways and English thought and language. I think he will say that the experiment succeeded. He assures me that it did. I have never claimed perfection for any group of people. I am aware that individuals will be found in any nationality, race, section or sect or class who betray undesirable traits. I have never glossed over this fact. I am a writer, not a partisan, and like

Thomas Hardy, I am conscious that there are those who "have causes to advance, privileges to guard, which a mere writer, who writes down how the things of the world strike him, may have overlooked and may by pure inadvertence have run foul of." It is possible, too, that partisans or experts will find that I have somewhere contradicted myself or been illogical. It may be.

To tell the truth [says my wise Anatole France] souls that are exempt from everything illogical frighten me, not being able to imagine that they are never mistaken, I am afraid that they may be always mistaken. Just as a vast country has the most diverse climates, there is hardly an expanded mind that does not contain numerous contradictions.

To resume, taking them in the lump, wherever the immigrants have been given a chance, they have proved to be good and adaptable material and have helped to develop the countries in which they have found their homes. They work hard, they are conscious of the fact that they have to justify themselves, they try to fit in, to cease to be outlandish and conspicuously different from their surroundings, and their children become an integral part of the life around them.

I am the last person in the world to make light of any constructive achievements, no matter by whom or where, and I am deeply moved by what is being done in the way of home- and life-building by Jewish settlers in Palestine, under the auspices of the British Government and the Zionist Organisation, in Biro-Bidjan, in the Crimea, in the Ukraine and elsewhere in the Soviet Union, under the auspices of the Soviet

Government and the big Jewish constructive relief organisations, like the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee of America and the O.R.T., in South America under the auspices of the Jewish Colonisation Association, and wherever else such work is being done by any group of people, in order to provide themselves with the ordinary means of livelihood and of human conditions, while at the same time creating economic and human values for the countries in which they live. I realise that great, noble centres of civilisation are not created overnight. The things that I find inadequate are immense advances on what was in these places before. Even London had to grow to become the dignified city we know to-day. There is a description of London in the days of Charles II which records that

the pavement was detestable: all foreigners cried shame upon it. The drainage was so bad that in rainy weather the gutters became torrents, carrying refuse. Garret windows were opened and pails were emptied with little regard to those who were passing below. The machinery for keeping the law was utterly contemptible. There were extensive districts in which no lamp was seen.

Work and enthusiasm and the proper utilisation of economic opportunities may work wonders anywhere. But I happen to share neither the Zionist nor the Soviet ideology, and I know that there are hundreds of thousands of Jewish would-be-immigrants in Eastern and Central Europe who do not share these ideologies, and who seek ordinary conditions of settlement in some "white-man's-country," where they will be able to feel at home, to become fully part of the life of the country and its people, to work there, and to



contribute to its development and greatness, asking for no separate rights save (important thing) the opportunity to practise their Jewish religion and to develop their Jewish religious heritage.

At the same time, I know that there are large tracts of undeveloped land in Canada, Australia and South America, which need labour and development. They are lands of promise that hold out great hopes for the future of the world. There are not only the hundreds of thousands of Jews in Eastern and Central Europe whom conditions in their native countries force to emigrate, but there are millions of others, non-Jewish people, human beings, who are equally forced by economic and political conditions to seek homes elsewhere. It should not be necessary to plead for the right of people to come and lend a hand to push forward the car of progress and civilisation in a place where there are not yet sufficient hands to be able to do it. In the same way as the earlier immigrants helped to build up the United States of America, and to create what is to-day developed civilised modern life in Canada, Australia and South America, these new immigrants would take a hand in the further opening up and development of the present under-populated areas. As Sir Joseph Cook wrote : " Australia's empty interior and its sparsely-peopled north may yet become the sphere of some of the country's most important activities." And that is true not only of Australia.

The development of the empty spaces of the earth is a paramount need, not only for the countries in which they are situated, but for the world at large. Even from the purely economic aspect, their development will provide the distressed industrial areas of

Europe with employment to supply their growing needs. A hundred years ago, in 1835, when the United States of America were at the height of their work of development, the London *Times* reported that in consequence there was

in the English manufacturing districts, at no former period, or at least for many years such briskness in nearly all the departments of manufactures as at the present moment. Many of the manufacturers and merchants have orders on hand which it would require twelve months to execute. Some are literally refusing orders for goods, and not sending out their travellers. A vast quantity of the goods now preparing is for the United States of America. As an instance of the present briskness in the iron and hardware departments, we are told that a merchant the other day received an order from America for £1,000 worth of nails, which he could get no nail manufacturer to begin executing sooner than three months afterwards. Such accounts as these are exceedingly gratifying, and we are glad to say that a similar healthful demand is in operation for several of our Scotch manufacturers. The manufacture of paper, which is principally carried on at Midlothian, is at present in great activity.

There is, of course, also the great fillip that this in brisk trade would give to the all-important shipping industry in carrying large quantities of goods and large numbers of settlers.

Consider the present important development work in Palestine. Captain W. F. Strickland, M.P., after visiting the Palestine and Levant Fair in Tel Aviv, declared in an address in Coventry that the immigration of Jews

has resulted in a pro-British feeling arising from the freedom given the new settlers to develop their own industries and open up the country, and that he saw many British-manufactured products in use there.

" It is a striving commercial country, anxious to trade with us." Even the visit paid to Palestine by Mr. Robert Hornsby, the Shorthorn cattle breeder, who was asked to advise upon the most suitable breed of cattle for the Jewish settlements, will result in replacing the Frisians mostly in use now by Ayrshires in many of the settlements.

Palestine industry requires raw materials, and together with agriculture must have machinery [Mr. J. L. Cohen, an economic authority of note, writes]. Certain foods and petrol must be imported. These are normally paid for by exports. But this does not apply in the same way to new and to immigration countries which, as a rule, import more than they export. The capitalists, large and small, who settle in the country must bring over their wealth in the form of goods, and against such imports there will be no balancing exports.

The *Near East and India* in its Palestine Supplement, published in April 1934, showed that "Some 60 per cent of Palestine's motor imports originate from Great Britain, while those of Syria come mainly from France and Germany."

I have no intention of pleading only on the grounds of sympathy on behalf of the many oppressed and starving Jews and others of Central and Eastern Europe. For I know that whatever response there is to the appeal to humanity, sympathy which does not happen to run parallel with economic possibilities remains ineffective. It is no use trying to relieve a problem in one place by shifting it to another. As Mr. Forgan Smith, the Labour Premier of Queensland, has pointed out (February 1936)

migration depends on a country's economic position. It

is wrong to assume that Australia is opposed to migration ; but we are not in a position at present to incur the financial obligations of absorbing a large number of people. There is no part of social life in which economic laws are more ruthlessly operative than in movements of population.

Economic laws, are, indeed, ruthlessly operative in all parts of social life. But I do not believe the economic crisis will last for ever. It was not here always. Nor is it but in its beginnings. It has already run a good part of its course. Fourteen years ago, in April 1922, the *Socialist Review*, then edited by J. Ramsay MacDonald, was writing of this " crisis in France, Germany, Italy and Russia. It is the price of war. The symptoms take a long time to show on the surface." We have now, perhaps, reached the peak, and may be about to start climbing down the other side. In fourteen years from now we may again be in the happy valleys of prosperity, no longer on the rocks. But the question is, meanwhile, if Australia or the other countries that need immigration could be relieved of the financial obligations of absorbing large numbers of immigrants, whether it would then be possible to proceed to arrange for the introduction of " the right proportion of labour and capital from overseas," in order that these countries " could go forward in a big way," as Mr. Stevens, the Prime Minister of New South Wales has said.

There are in Germany and Poland and elsewhere many Jews possessed of sufficient capital and expert knowledge to transplant important secondary industries to the new countries, men of skill and ability and experience, who could bring over, too, a certain number of skilled workers in these industries and would

within a few years be able to provide employment also for large numbers of native workers. It seems to be the most satisfactory way of absorbing the existing unemployed, by putting them to work in new expanding industries. It seems to be also the most satisfactory way of peopling the more empty parts of the country, and of opening up the sparsely-populated interior and north, in order to make them a sphere of important activities. It has been officially stated in the House of Commons by the Home Office that even in England, which is not by any means undeveloped, thousands of British employees have found work in new enterprises established by German Jewish refugees, a number far greater than the refugees who have established themselves in the country. This bears out the experience of the older immigrants "who introduced into England the manufacture of cheap clothing, mantle-making and ladies' tailoring, and developed the fur and rubber trades. The evidence presented to the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration in 1902-3, before which the founders of various trades appeared, contains much interesting information on these points." I know a refugee settled in England for over three years, who has established an enterprise employing many hundreds of British workers (non-Jewish, most of them). And he is willing to extend his operations by establishing or helping to establish enterprises elsewhere, if these other countries will make it possible for a few of his friends and associates, fellow-refugees, to settle there and engage in them, enterprises which would probably provide employment for hundreds more native workers. There are no doubt many others with whom this could be arranged.

The necessary assurances could be asked for and given, in the same way as they have been given in the case of Palestine by the Jewish Agency. The words applied by the Jewish Agency to the important work that is being carried on in Palestine are equally applicable under similar conditions elsewhere :

The economic capacity to absorb a greater population than it at present carries will always depend on the development of the country's resources, on the influx of Jewish men and money. The economic potentialities of the country are at present increasing rapidly with the introduction of modern methods of agriculture, the growth of fruit cultivation and export, the establishment of new industries, the increase of internal markets consequent on the arrival of fresh settlers with a high standard of living. This development is still in its early stages ; fostered by wise planning and given favourable conditions it may be expected to continue for many years to come. Much of what has been done in these directions has been achieved by Jewish enterprise and Jewish labour. Immigration for many years to come will develop, not exhaust, the riches of the country.

The functions assumed by the Zionist Organisation through its Palestine offices in the various countries and through its Executive in Palestine with regard to the selection and training of prospective immigrants and to their securing a footing in the economic life of the country have relieved the Administration of the difficult and delicate task of dealing direct with the countries of Jewish emigration.

Lord Marley, speaking in the House of Lords on February 26, 1936, said that

the problem of Palestine has become not a British problem nor a Jewish problem nor an Arab problem, but has become an international problem, which is of vital importance to many nations of the world. During the last few years

Jewish people have gone to settle in Palestine, and last year the number reached a figure of something like 40,000. In that year Palestine contributed to dealing with the problem of German refugees by receiving no fewer than 30,000 Jewish refugees who had been compelled to flee from Germany. That is a contribution to a problem facing the whole world, for which the whole world must be grateful. Lord Bearsted and Sir Herbert Samuel, who have made a recent visit to America, have envisaged a plan whereby eventually the whole of the Jewish population of Germany might be evacuated, based on an emigration of 100,000 over four years, and the proposition is that Palestine should contribute to the solution by receiving some 50,000 of those refugees.

Further, Lord Melchett has pointed out that there is an equal and to some extent even a worse problem in Poland. In the Polish Parliament at the beginning of last week one speaker—the Prince Radziwill—complained that the quota allowance in Palestine for German-Jewish immigrants was higher than the allowance for Poland, although there was a much larger number of would-be emigrants from Poland, because Germany had instituted a reign of terror. Poland, Rumania, Latvia, Esthonia, and Lithuania are all involved in this problem, and I urge that nothing shall be done to make more difficult the reception of these refugees and would-be emigrants in Palestine in the future, but that rather everything shall be done to increase the capacity of Palestine to receive them.

Lord Melchett, speaking on the same occasion, said :

We have a problem of slum clearance which begins in Vienna and goes across the world in every direction. From Berlin to Bucharest, from Vienna to Warsaw, we have oppressed people, and we have got to move them. We must be allowed to develop a National Home. It means life and death to the young men of our generation. It is our only hope. It is the Jewish population of Palestine that has built that country up. The Jewish population of Palestine has given you a surplus on the Budget at a time

when practically no other country in the world had a surplus. It is the Jewish population which has developed the country, which has drained the Emek, which has developed the Dead Sea, and which has brought into Palestine a culture of which many European nations might be proud. It is not only on the industrial side and it is not only by emigration, but it is in the fundamental culture of civilisation that we are bringing something to that country. There is a job to be done. There is a new country to be created. We can do that job. To take only one example, the development of the city of Tel-Aviv from a handful of houses on a sandy shore to a great city of 100,000 people. It was described by Lord Allenby, who has perhaps as great a right to speak on this subject as any living man, in these terms: "The faith which upheld the founders and inspired the builders of Tel-Aviv has been magnificently justified by the Tel-Aviv of to-day, which is a glowing testimony to the creative genius of the Hebrew race." It is a matter of common sense that the Arab population will benefit enormously from the result of all that. The time will come when the Palestinian Arab, standing head and shoulders above his contemporary in Syria or Iraq, or any other of the great countries, will provide the leaders to develop those countries and those great territories at their disposal—provide leaders who have been educated and who have grown up in the civilisation which we shall create. That is the vision that I have of the future of Palestine and of the co-operation of the Jew and Arab together. It is the attitude of the Jewish Agency, and is what we believe to be a sound line of development.

A campaign to raise a fund of £3,000,000 is now being conducted by the Council for German Jewry. Sir Herbert Samuel, speaking at a London Conference held in March 1936, in connection with this campaign, Mr. Anthony de Rothschild presiding, said that

None of them could have foreseen that as many as 300,000 Jews would have gone to Palestine within a brief



period. That was what had happened ; and still there would be room for very many more. Their task would be to help to develop and increase the absorptive capacity of Palestine, in order that it might afford a home for hundreds of thousands more refugees from Europe. It was hoped that in four years, which was the period they envisaged, possibly 50,000 German refugees would go to Palestine. They could not foretell exactly, but it would be about 10,000 to 12,000 a year, and since immigration last year was 60,000, it ought not to be impossible for 10 to 12,000 Jews to go each year within the next four years. They hoped to find similar opportunities in other places in the world for many more. Probably small numbers would go to a great variety of countries. The figure of 10 to 12,000 a year over the whole of Asia, Africa and America, apart from Europe, was not an unimaginable figure. It was hoped to set on foot new enterprises here in Great Britain. Many of the refugees here had already established new enterprises, and he was informed by the German Refugees' Committee that they estimated that between 6,000 to 7,000 British employees had found work in the new enterprises established by German Jewish refugees, a number far greater than the refugees who were established here. The immigration had proved not to increase British unemployment, but to decrease it. The same thing applied to Holland. If it were possible for the new immigrants to take with them their property from Germany, the movement would be greatly facilitated, and the number of new enterprises would be considerably increased. The task of the new Council would be to encourage the training of the immigrants in the occupations mostly in demand in the countries to which they would go, to help secure their transport, to provide loans, which they would expect to be repaid and which the refugees themselves would wish to repay. They were self-respecting people and self-reliant, and had no desire to be recipients of charity.

A great deal must be done in preparing the immigrants so that they would fit into their new surroundings, and

so quickly prove their worth as citizens of their new countries [Mr. Anthony de Rothschild, the chairman of the meeting emphasised],

and Dr. Weizmann said that

the more people that went to Palestine, the greater possibilities for greater absorption. He had once been told that there was not room to swing a cat in Palestine. Since that statement, a great many cats had been swung there—30,000 German immigrants in the last two-and-a-half years. Polish Jewry had also benefited, and Polish immigration had been made possible because of the German immigration.

No one, whatever their attitude to Zionism as a belief, underestimates or would wish to hamper what is being done in this direction in Palestine. Whatever their misgivings on account of other matters, affecting citizenship, nationality, religion, the Jewish problem, the Jewish State idea, economic outlook, the Levant question and the like, no one will deny the economic importance of the Jewish work in Palestine or withhold from it sympathy and support.

And the same is true, whatever we think of Sovietism, of the purely economic settlement of Jews in Biro-Bidjan and other parts of the Soviet Union, and equally true of the Jewish settlement in South America and anywhere else where constructive settlement and up-building and human salvage is being carried on.

All of them are important, and all are great human achievements. But the need is so great that more outlets still must be found. With all Palestine's astonishing development and its increasing absorptive capacity, it is a small country, about the size of Wales. It was that thorough-going veteran Zionist, L. J. Greenberg, who wrote :

Judea as a point of Jewish settlement is not anywhere in the same street as Texas or New York. To suggest Palestine in the same street as some vast tract of fertile land in some country with illimitable material prospects is ridiculous.

Every highly industrialised country, even England, certainly America, has at one stage been a pastoral country, in which agriculture and stock-raising have given way, never wholly, for they are essential, to manufacture and industry, enabling them, as Buckle said "to increase the national wealth and doing immense service to civilisation, and giving rise to a new class of employments." It is this increase of national wealth and service to civilisation that is all-important.

After all, the great mass of the Jews of the world are not Zionist, just as they are not Itoist or anything else beyond the fact that they are Jews, and they are not committed to Zionism as a doctrine or to Palestine as a territory. To many Jews, it is true, Zionism and Judaism are identical, or at least Judaism which does not include Zionism and Palestine is an incomplete Judaism. I do not believe that, and as for the great mass of Jews, who like the great mass of any other people anywhere are not politically minded and are certainly not doctrinaires of my or any other school, they are interested in bread and peace and the right to live. If Zionism and Palestine are to-day important in the world of Jews, it is not for reasons of doctrine or ideology, but because it offers to many and it is hoped that it will offer to many more the bread and peace and right to live which they need and which they are in many places denied. Dr. Eder, who died recently,

complained in 1927, when he was President of the English Zionist Federation, that although some people thought that the whole Jewish world was Zionist, the Zionist Organisation was representative only of a very small number of Jews. The history of Zionism shows that until it was able to offer Jews something tangible, settlement in Palestine, immigration certificates, the opportunity to live decent lives under the ægis of the British mandate, and to earn their livelihood, it was a very small and albeit a courageous and determined movement, confined to a relatively small number of enthusiasts. Mr. Paul Goodman's *Zionism in England—1899-1929* describes very illuminatingly the vicissitudes through which Zionism in England passed until it secured the Balfour Declaration.

In the early days, of course, the "so-called Political Zionists had, in an ever-growing measure, the Community against them. Viewed at close range, those were the days of small things, pathetically small when placed in comparison with the mighty object attempted." Later, "the loss of that powerful element in the Zionist movement which went over to the Jewish Territorial Organisation weakened seriously the English Zionist Federation," and "apart from this formidable secession Zionism in England was torn to shreds and tatters by passionate conflicts between its most devoted adherents." When the war came,

outside the stalwart Zionist ranks there was a decided feeling in the Anglo-Jewish Community that this was not the time when Jews should pursue any "sectional" interests and that the question as to the future of Palestine should be relegated to the time when the War will have been over and done with. The "neutral" Palestine

Society composed of a number of Palestinophiles, with a stiffening of full-blooded Zionists, ceased to exist.

Jabotinsky, who came to England during the War to work for the formation of the Jewish Regiment, writes in his book :

There were the Zionists. The Organisation in England was at that time even smaller and less influential than it is to-day. I met the younger generation of English Zionists. Their idol was Achad Ha'am. They laughed at my idea, some tolerantly, others rudely.

Mr. Goodman speaks of " the formation under Mr. Jabotinsky's compelling initiative of a Jewish Battalion for service on the Palestine front—an historically appropriate solution."

" It seemed in August 1914 as if Zionism were to be relegated to the limbo of lost causes beyond the reach of all possible propaganda," Mr. Goodman continues his history, only to show how finally, since the issue of the Balfour Declaration and the ratification of the Palestine Mandate the movement has grown from strength to strength, and " now that, under God's providence, the establishment and development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine are placed under the auspices of Great Britain, the political importance of the English Zionist Federation does not need to be emphasised." Even, he writes,

the journalistic output of the Zionist movement in Great Britain up till 1917 was merely of a haphazard character. The Anglo-Jewish Community was unfriendly. The *Jewish Chronicle* represented the distinctly hostile attitude of the leaders of the Community. The repeated efforts to set up a Zionist Press in this country were short-lived and could hardly claim to have been successful from any point of view.

To-day, the Anglo-Jewish Press, headed by the *Jewish Chronicle*, like the Jewish Press of almost every country, is completely Zionist. There has been "a transformation of Jewish public opinion." But all the same "the extent of the Zionist Organisation itself bears no adequate relation to those powerful Jewish influences created by Zionists." In membership, as Dr. Eder pointed out, the Zionist Organisation is representative only of a small number of Jews. I see in the *Jewish Chronicle* (April 3, 1936) that "the Netherlands Zionist Federation has arranged a campaign to arouse greater interest in Zionism among Dutch Jewry." In the United States, membership of the Zionist Organisation," as distinct from support of the Palestine funds, has always been a problem, regularly debated at its Conventions, and once there was even a proposal put forward "to make every contributor to the United Palestine Appeal a member of the Zionist Organisation." What provides Zionism with its strength is the desire, indeed, the anxiety of most Jews who are not Zionists to assist in the constructive work in Palestine. It was this that brought about the constitution of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, with such powerful supporters as the late Louis Marshall, Mr. Felix Warburg, Sir Osmond d'Avigdor Goldsmid, Sir Robert Waley Cohen, Dr. Cyrus Adler and many others, including such specialists as Dr. Karpf, Mr. Morris Waldman and Dr. Golub, to mention only a few. And though Mr. Goodman writes in his history, published in 1929, that "there has been no reconciliation between the Zionists and the League of British Jews, which was established at Messrs. Rothschild's offices at New Court in November

1917, as a body in direct opposition to Zionism," the fact is that not only has the League of British Jews, particularly since it went into abeyance at the end of 1929, shown no hostility to the Zionist work in Palestine, but some of its members have supported it. Mr. Laurie Magnus was a fervent adherent of the Jewish Agency, and Lord Bearsted is now associated with Sir Herbert Samuel and Mr. Simon Marks in the leadership of the new Council for German Jewry which is working together with the Jewish Agency. Even the Shekel, the voting-card to the Zionist Congresses, which is regarded as indicating Zionist membership, means no more in many cases than general support of the practical constructive Jewish work in Palestine, support which would be gladly extended also to other practical constructive Jewish work outside Palestine, and equally so by the great majority of the most convinced and partisan Zionists.

I have not written this with any desire to minimise the importance of the Zionist movement, but to show that it has rallied for its really effective achievements not so much Zionists, but Jews, who are available for all other constructive practical Jewish work. And without any desire to "inform" against the Zionist movement, but because it is a fact that should be made clear, I suggest that most of these Jews would prefer that this constructive practical work should be carried on without the constant need of complaining about broken promises and violated pledges that Zionism in Palestine involves.

Here we are [wrote Mr. Ben Gurion, for instance, in 1930] after twelve years of ambiguity in the Mandatory's stand towards us, of promises unkept and rights contravened.

Throughout this period we have been unfairly discriminated against in the allocation of lands, the distribution of revenue benefits, the employment on public works, the organisation of defence. Let us by all means be just and admit that we have also had the advantage of very tangible and important assistance. We have been enabled to bring in 100,000 Jews and to create agricultural, industrial and educational enterprises which withstood the terrible shock of August last. Perhaps we have not always made full use of the opportunities available, but even then our achievements are such that even a richer and stronger people than ours might well be proud of them. Has England now made up her mind to stifle the growth of this great undertaking and to break the bond concluded twelve years ago between her and the Jewish people?

And the *New Judea* in an editorial on the new measure proposed for the restriction of the sale of land in Palestine, claims that "the proposed legislation ignores a definite pledge by the Government, on record in a State document, in regard to the land question. It has become the habit of the Government to overlook certain fundamentals in connection with the Jewish National Home." This charge of broken promises seems to ignore the proverbial purpose of promises being made to be broken. It happens everywhere, in public and private life. That was a broken promise that was made during the War about making England a land fit for heroes to live in. Breaking promises is a part of the process of life, and it is futile to insist on the broken promise to Jews in Palestine as if it were something novel in human affairs. Laudin, the lawyer in Wasserman's *Wedlock*, has become saddened by his years of contemplation of this "untenableness of those social relations which had been entered into in the name of the law and in the name of religion,



with a claim—and this claim was usually sincere at the time—to eternal endurance.” Zionists sometimes fail to realise that their little craft is not alone on the waters, that there are tides and counter-tides and gulf-streams and cross-currents and much other navigation besides themselves. Not even all Jewish interests lie on that brave craft, not a tithe of them.

The Zionist experiment [writes Professor Edward Sapier] is an admirable solution insofar as it satisfies the aspirations of many thousands of courageous Jews, inspired by a number of distinct motives. One gains nothing by closing one's eyes to facts and declaring out of the fervour of one's preference this or that turn to be the right and only solution. For there is not one Jewish problem, there are many—keenly personal ones of all sorts, and varying group problems conditioned by local circumstances, economic and cultural.

And so, to-day it is not a question so much of political safeguards and of Zionist ideology, admittedly important though these are to a very large and influential minority of those that think about these things. It is rather a question of homes and bread, of outlets for the elementary human needs of working, earning, producing, being at home in a land of one's own, taking a worthy and decent part in the economic and social life of the country on whose soil we live, and beneath which we shall lie, and on which our children will contrive to live and work.

The war for Jewish emancipation, I have written, cannot be fought without casualties any more than any other war. When some opponents of Zionism proclaimed Zionism dead, because there had been disturbances in Palestine in 1920, 1921, 1929, and now in 1936, or because there were economic difficulties, as

there were in 1926, I refused to accept the specious argument. Palestine cannot be rebuilt without casualties. The struggle of the Zionists for their ideal is not an easy struggle. It would not command the respect it does if it were. Right or wrong, feasible or not, it has a noble dream behind it, even if some of the camp-followers to-day are "cashing-in" on the arduous labours and the sacrifices of the early pioneers whom they at first scoffed at. "Had our Herzl not been also a poet, I think he would never have undertaken the whole affair," Wolfsohn, his successor as President of the Zionist Organisation, once said. But if at the height of the black days of 1929 I saw that Zionism would emerge from them stronger and more consolidated, that the dark days were the inevitable alternation to the bright days that had been and would be again, I see equally that the reverses that have been suffered by the cause of Jewish emancipation are also not the final defeat. It, too, will recover. There is ebb and flow in everything. Emancipation will have its victory yet. If not, God help us all, for we are all so interrelated that if emancipation crash, even its enemy, Zionism, will crash, too, because it cannot possibly sustain the weight of all those many millions whom the crash of emancipation would thrust upon it.

I started out by asking, what will happen to the Jews? Not because I want to suggest or can suggest what will happen to them, but because I am myself very much concerned to know what will happen to them, to these millions of the Jewish masses who want only to be allowed to earn their bread and to be left in peace. And I conclude by asking the conscience

and also the self-interest of the world at this time, when there are so many people who in over-congested and crisis-ridden countries in Europe stand homeless and dispossessed, are degraded and thrust out, and plead with the world for a chance to live and work ; and there are openings in other under-populated countries that need population, workers, and development, that will be of benefit to them and to the world at large ; if they need not incur the financial obligations of absorbing the new immigrants, if these can be provided for them, and the immigrants find their own resources for bringing to places like, for one, " Australia's empty interior and sparsely-peopled north " the means of making them " the sphere of some of the country's most important activities," why should not these two needs join together, to the mutual advantage of all concerned ?

The shapes arise !

Shapes of factories, arsenals, foundries, markets,

Shapes of the two-threaded tracks of railroads,

Shapes of the sleepers of bridges, vast frameworks, girders, arches,

Shapes of the fleets of barges, tows, lake and canal craft, river craft,

Ship-yards and dry-docks along the Eastern and Western seas, and in many a bay and by-place,

The live-oak kelsons, the pine planks, the spars, the hack-matack-roots for knees,

The ships themselves and their ways, the tiers of scaffolds, the workmen busy outside and inside,

The tools lying around, the great auger and little auger, the adze, bolt, line, square, gouge, and bead-plane.

Shapes of turbulent manly cities,

Shapes bracing the earth and braced with the whole earth.

Acc. No.

12351





